DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 161 215 EC 112 351

AUTHOR	Adler, Sarah Jane; And Others
TITLE	High/Scope Foundation - B.E.H. Special Project for the Preparation of Preschool Specialists. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, Ypsilanti, Mich.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Personnel Preparation.
PUB DATE	Aug 77
GRANT	OEG-0-73-6144
NOTE	146p.; Print is marginal and may not reproduce well in hard copy
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Audiovisual Aids; Curriculum Design; Early Childhood Education; Evaluation Methods; *Handicapped Children; *Inservice Programs; *Inservice Teacher Education; Learning Modules; Mainstreaming; Models; Multimedia Instruction; Preschool Education; *Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; Program Planning; Summative Evaluation; Teacher Education; Teaching Guides; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

Described is an inservice training program for early childhood special education teachers who work with non-categorical or integrated (handicapped and nonhandicapped) groups of preschool children. Chapter 1 presents an overview of the project. Chapter 2 reviews the content and structure of the curriculum framework and presents a cognitively oriented curriculum model, while the third chapter discusses the teacher training model developed by the project. The multimedia training modules or learning packages are described in chapter 4, which also lists the audiovisual materials and outlines the contents of the trainer's manual and teacher's manual. The field sites where field testing of the training system occurred are summarized in chapter 5, along with some of the issues involved in disseminating a curriculum model. Evaluation procedures are results utilized in developing the training materials are described in chapter 6. Chapter 7 addresses the process by which program consultants were trained to serve as links in the training model. The final chapter looks ahead to plan for wider use of the training system and materials developed by the project.
(Author/BD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED161215

HIGH/SCOPE FOUNDATION - B.E.H. SPECIAL PROJECT FOR THE PREPARATION OF PRESCHOOL SPECIALISTS

Final Report, August, 1977

Grant # OEG-0-73-6144

Submitted to: Dr. Philip Burke
Division of Personnel Preparation
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
U.S. Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D. C. 20202

Submitted by: Bernard Banet, Director
High/Scope Special Project

Sections of this report were written by:

Sarah Jane Adler
Bernard Banet
Jan Diamondstone
Jean Ispa
Robert D. Matz
Sheila Mainwaring
Lucrecia Peters
Linda Rogers
Lawrence Schweinhart

EC 11 2351

HIGH/SCOPE EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH FOUNDATION
600 North River St.
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197
313-485-2000

Table of Contents

Preface

Project Staff, 1974-77

Chapter 1: Overview. 1

Chapter 2: The Curriculum Model. 3

Chapter 3: The Training Model. 39

Chapter 4: Multi-media Training Packages 42

Chapter 5: Field Site Training 51

Chapter 6: Evaluation of Training. 62

Chapter 7: Inservice Training of High/Scope Staff. . . . 117

Chapter 8: Dissemination of Model & Materials. 125

PREFACE

The High/Scope Special Project has produced a substantial number of training films, printed training materials, and evaluation instruments. Another important output has been the enhancement of the individual capabilities of all the project's staff as well as the trainers and teachers with whom we worked and from whom we learned. These "products" represent the project's accomplishments better than this report.

Capturing the process of a training project is difficult to do in a document such as this. To convey the work of the project, we would need to show you filmed scenes of:

- Linda Rogers setting off for remotest New Jersey laden with films and handouts weighing almost as much as she does.
- Jan Diamondstone and her video crew trying to follow an active preschooler through the daily routine in the classroom with camera and microphone boom.
- The local field trainers from five states assembled at High/Scope, trying to pin down a definition of the "key experiences" in a session with Susan Shipstead and Joanna Phinney.
- Sally Adler screening hours of clips from the project's video library in order to illustrate teamwork in the classroom and the teachers' team planning cycle.
- Bob Matz and Jean Ispa working with Sharon Bixby and Bettye McDonald to define levels of teacher competencies for the "PTTP."
- Carole Thomson and field consultants discussing the crucial aspects of an introductory workshop.
- Dennis Ackley making a TV star of Dave Weikart on the "Thinking & Reasoning" videotape.

We would need a tape recorder to capture echoes such as:

"Help! the tape won't track!"

"What do <u>you</u> know about special ed?"

"But don't you think <u>affect</u> is important?"

"But <u>my</u> kids are <u>really</u> handicapped."

"Don't you think we should prepare these children for first grade?"

"But these children can't make choices."

"What I need is the curriculum in a box."

"Let's forget about the media and the manual; it's the charisma of the consultant that counts."

"Sorry, Bernie, but I'm (getting married/pregnant/going to Stanford to get my Ph.D., not going to travel any more)."

SPECIAL PROJECT STAFF, 1973-77

Dennis Ackley, Media Producer/Director
Marilyn Adams, Field Consultant/Curriculum Specialist
Sara Jane Adler, Field Consultant/Curriculum Specialist
Bernard Banet, Director
Sharon Bixby, Field Consultant/Curriculum Specialist
Albert Brown, Field Consultant/Curriculum Specialist
Jan Diamondstone, Instructional Systems Specialist
Gwen Coppersmith, Editor/Writer
Sue Condon, Secretary
Jack Giannosa, Media Technician
Mary Hohmann, Editor/Writer
Jean Ispa, Evaluator
Sylvia Jenkins, Secretary
Robert Matz, Evaluator
Bettye McDonald, Field Consultant/Curriculum Specialist
Becky McLaughlin, Secretary
Juanita Mendez, Evaluator
John Morales, Field Consultant/Curriculum Specialist
Pat Mullaly, Graphic Production
Joanna Phinney, Field Consultant/Curriculum Specialist
Sarah Preuter, Secretary
Linda Rogers, Field Consultant/Curriculum Specialist
Susan Shipstead, Field Consultant/Curriculum Specialist
Charles Silverman, Publications Coordinator/Editor
Carole Thomson, Field Consultant/Curriculum Specialist
Sheryl Vigmostad, Secretary
David P. Weikart, Project Monitor

OVERVIEW

The High/Scope Special Project for the Preparation of Preschool Specialists, 1973-1977, developed an inservice training program for early childhood special education teachers who work with non-categorical or integrated (handicapped and non-handicapped) groups of preschool children. The training program is based on the High/Scope Cognitively Oriented Preschool Curriculum.

This curriculum has been validated through longitudinal research. As an "open framework" it stimulates the creativity of teachers and invites active learning. As a program for all children the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum stresses each child's strengths and interests rather than his or her deficits and handicaps. The High/Scope Curriculum framework assists teachers in planning developmentally appropriate activites for a diverse group of children.

State, local, and federal legislation and judicial decisions have created new mandates to public schools to provide services to handicapped preschool children and their families. In this context the project's accomplishments are timely and important.

The project played a major role in developing a series of multi-media learning packages. These include:

- Approximately eight hours of disseminable film products (transfers of slide/tape and videotape to 16mm film) for staff development and teacher training in early childhood education.
- A teacher's manual for the Cognitively Oriented Preschool Curriculum.
- A trainer's manual for the Cognitively Oriented Preschool Curriculum containing workshop outlines based on the audiovisual training media.

Also developed was the High/Scope Preschool Teacher Training Profile (PTTP), an instrument for summarizing training needs and degree of model implementation at field sites.

The High/Scope Child Observation Record (COR) for preschool was field tested by the project. The COR is an observational instrument for summarizing child learning in the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum.

Project staff provided inservice training to over 400 teachers and aides in school districts in five states: Michigan, New Jersey, Virginia, Maryland, and Ohio. Particularly noteworthy is the statewide dissemination network in New Jersey, set up in cooperation with the New Jersey Department of Education. In addition, eleven High/Scope field consultants and twenty local curriculum assistants were trained as key leaders in the dissemination/replication of the curriculum and the training model.

The work of the project meshed with a BEH First Chance Project, the High/Scope Demonstration Preschool Project, (OEG-0-74-2720). The First Chance Project operated a demonstration classroom in Ypsilanti in which some of the Special Project's audiovisual materials were recorded for production of audiovisual training materials.

The work of the Social Project will be continued in 1977-78 by two new High/Scope BEH-funded projects (First Chance Outreach and a training project) and via a contract with the New Jersey Department of Education.

Chapter 2 of this report reviews the content and structure of the curriculum framework, the High/Scope Cognitively Oriented Curriculum.

Chapter 3 discusses the teacher training model developed by the project.

The multimedia training modules or learning packages are described in Chapter 4, which also lists the audiovisual materials and outlines the contents of the trainer's manual and teacher's manual.

The field sites where field testing of the training system is occurring are summarized in Chapter 5, along with some of the issues involved in disseminating a curriculum model.

Evaluation procedures and results utilized in developing the training materials are described in Chapter 6. A multi-method evaluation process was used. Written assessments of learning package effectiveness, a classroom observation instrument, and trainee questionnaires and Q-sorts are summarized and compared.

Chapter 7 addresses the process by which High/Scope consultants were trained in Ypsilanti to serve as links in the training model. The final chapter, Chapter 8, looks ahead to plans for wider use of the training system and materials developed by the project.

THE CURRICULUM MODEL

A Developmental Approach for Preschool Children With Special Needs *

- Bernard Banet

There are two basic approaches to the design of individualized educational programs for young handicapped children--the diagnostic/corrective approach and the developmental approach. Programs based on the pedagogical logic of diagnosis and correction assume that the major purpose of early educational intervention is to identify areas in which the child shows a deficit in relation to his age peers, or a lack of consistency in his own performance. Testing often provides the data for educational prescriptions in the diagnostic/corrective mode. From information about the child's deficits, specific objectives can be developed which represent steps toward remediation of the deficit. Sometimes information about the etiology of a particular handicapping condition is used in making educational plans or "prescriptions." Or the technology of behavior modification may be used by the special education interventionist. Incentives or "reinforcers" may be systematically used to motivate attainment of objectives.

Diagnostic/corrective interventions typically assume not only that the child must be motivated by adults (therapist, teacher, parents) but that he or she must be "taught" new skills in a direct, didactic way. Often the teaching is done in clinical sessions where a particular skill is persistently and patiently drilled by the special educator. Diagnostic/corrective logic is linked to the assumptions that underlie the entire field of special education. Such assumptions have given rise to the existence of separate professional specialities within special education and to the procedures enacted into state and federal law by which children are categorized according to diagnostic labels before they can receive special education services.

* Draft submitted for publication in Open Education and Young Children With Special Needs, Dr. Samuel J. Meisels, editor. Baltimore: University Park Press, In press, 1978.

In contrast, programs based on the logic of "developmental validity" attempt primarily to promote learning experiences that exercise and extend developmentally emerging abilities that expand the learners' interests and long-term plans, and that are optimally timed for ease of learning and retention.

A developmental approach has elements that are analogous to "diagnosis" and "prescription," but the individualized programs that evolve in a developmental program do not start with an analysis of a child's deficits. Rather, educators seeking to implement developmentally valid programs for handicapped children identify the child's status on a developmental continuum and provide experiences which permit the child to exercise emerging abilities that in most cases the child will be strongly motivated to use.* A developmentalist identifies the experiences which challenge and help the child to practice broadly generalizable skills that are typical for children at that particular developmental period. It is assumed, at least as an initial strategy, that the child can take a very active role in defining for himself the appropriate developmental "match" between his skills and the learning activities he or she engages in. In other words, a developmental approach need not substitute highly specific developmental-sequential information for highly specific behavioral deficit information. The child as well as the adult has a role in planning and selecting activities.

In this chapter the High/Scope Cognitively Oriented Curriculum will be described as an example of a developmental approach in early childhood special education. The chapter will present the historical background and basic goals and strategies of the High/Scope model. Some important child outcome data will also be presented.

---

* The Child Observation Record, described on pages assists teachers to observe children in developmental terms.

The High/Scope Approach

The Cognitively Oriented Curriculum is a framework for early childhood education derived from Piagetian principles and developed by the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation under the leadership of David P. Weikart. The Curriculum had its origin in one of the first early childhood intervention programs of the '60's, the Ypsilanti-Perry Preschool Project, and has evolved as an early childhood model used in the High/Scope demonstration classrooms as well as in preschool, infant and elementary programs in many locations throughout the world. (Weikart, et al., 1971; Hohmann and Banet, 1978).

The High/Scope Foundation is completing a four-year cycle of work funded by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. The Cognitively Oriented Curriculum has been used with an integrated group of handicapped and nonhandicapped children in First Chance demonstration preschool classes in Ypsilanti, Michigan. High/Scope Foundation staff have been working with teachers in several states to gauge the curriculum's usefulness as an inservice training vehicle in special education preschool programs.

At the demonstration classroom in Ypsilanti one third of the children are handicapped as defined by criteria used by the Michigan Department of Education to indicate eligibility for school services under Michigan's mandatory special education legislation. The handicapped children served by the project were also screened on criteria relating to the probability that they would be mainstreamed in later schooling, since the purpose was specifically to demonstrate a program that could make an important difference in children's later school careers. The High/Scope First Chance project serves children who are labelled under state guidelines as mentally retarded (educable or trainable), language impaired, physically or otherwise health handicapped (e.g. epilipsy, scoleosis, cerebral palsy, muscular dystrophy, stroke, heart disease), hearing impaired, or emotionally disturbed. At centers in Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio, Virginia and Maryland the High/Scope model is being used with a very broad range

of children, including some youngsters more severely "involved" than most in the Ypsilanti program. The teacher-child ratio in the Ypsilanti classroom has been 1:7 with two professional teachers in charge of a class session.

High/Scope's work with handicapped preschoolers is an outgrowth of universally applicable developmental principles. The view that certain handicapping conditions are developmental delays may be one very effective general strategy within a framework that is based on developmental universals. Such an approach assumes that the best way to promote growth in a four-year-old child who is two years behind his age peers in intellectual and verbal development is to provide the rich variety of concrete experience and accompanying language activities that one provides for a nonhandicapped two-year-old. Attempts to target certain narrow behaviors that appear more age-appropriate for a four-year-old may only result in very narrow learning, not generalizable to other skills, and not matching the child's motivational inclinations.

For a child who is not neurologically impaired but shows developmental lags because of sensory or motor limitations, the educator's task is to mobilize the child's existing resources toward achieving developmentally appropriate intellectual and social competencies. These skills may be channeled in different ways and through different media--for example, communication for a deaf child may include experiences with signing rather than exclusively with oral language--but the experiential base that provides interesting things to talk about, a reason and an invitation to communicate, must be present. This set of active experiences should be basically the same for the deaf child and hearing child, or the language-impaired child and the child with "normal" language.

Teachers in a Cognitively Oriented program focus on experiences pertaining to developmental processes rather than on behavioral outcomes. Such experiences are labeled "key experiences." These are the classes of active experience that cognitive developmental theory suggests are involved in mastery of the developmental tasks of the preschool-age child. These key experiences

are used to plan activities for groups of children as well as to provide a way of thinking about individual children. They are called "experiences" rather than goals in order to emphasize for teachers the many different ways each of them can occur in the life of a child. This is more useful than thinking of experiences as "attainable" concepts to be checked off and perhaps never returned to.

We try to maintain a balance of teacher initiation and child initiation. The child makes an explicit plan each day and the adult helps the child first to formulate and then to carry out that plan. Adult interactions with children often occur in the context of helping a child to examine ways of accomplishing his or her plan.

To create an environment where the key experiences are likely to occur and where children can plan a variety of activities, the High/Scope framework suggests a room arrangement and a daily routine specifically designed to encourage active learning. Such an environment has a variety of work areas or interest centers (for example, a block area, an art area, a role play or "house" area, and an area for small manipulative materials). The routine is structured to permit a variety of modes of interaction with peers and adults: small group activities, outdoor play, whole class games and musical activities. At the heart of the day is the "work time" in which children make a plan, carry out their chosen activities in the various interest centers, and then discuss and represent their activities afterward. The routine is maintained consistently so that children can operate within a predictable timeflow from day to day.

Adults are encouraged to develop very general strategies in order to provide an optimum match between a child's classroom activities and the appropriate "key experiences." These very broad strategies are exactly the same for handicapped and non-handicapped children.

General Strategies Supporting Child Development

1. Providing concrete, active experiences which are extended via representation

The cycle of children's experiences begins with concrete materials and physical involvement, both sensory and motoric. Very young children or children who are still functioning primarily at the sensori-motor level may continue at this concrete level. Those who are able to use more abstract mental abilities are encouraged to extend their active, concrete experience via representations in a variety of modes, including language. Relating representational activities to concrete events or experiences is viewed as important even when children are able to deal with the concept or event on a more symbolic level. Representational activity may be channeled by the teacher, but the specific content and style of the representation is not dictated by the adult. The "key experiences" most relevant for this basic strategy of extending active, concrete experiences through language and representation are grouped as follows:

Active Learning

--Exploring actively and with all senses.
--Discovering relations through direct experience.
--Manipulating, transforming and combining materials.
--Using large muscles.
--Taking care of own needs.
--Choosing materials.
--Acquiring skill with tools and equipment.

Language

--Conversing about personally meaningful experiences with adults and peers.
--Describing (and listening to others describe) objects, events, and relations.
--Expressing feelings in words.
--Having one's own spoken language written down by an adult and read back.
--Having fun with language: rhyming, making up stories, listening to poems and stories.

Representation

--Recognizing objects by sound, touch, taste, and smell.
--Imitating actions.
--Relating pictures, photographs, and models of real places and things.
--Role playing, pretending.
--Constructing models out of clay, blocks, etc.
--Making drawings and paintings.

Some "special needs children" are still functioning at the sensorimotor level when they are three years old or older. For these children, as well as for others with less severe delays, the basic manipulative/exploratory activities are the developmentally appropriate ones; there is no attempt to extend these activities immediately into ones that require high level (i.e. more abstract) symbolic or representational processes. Thus, for a developmentally delayed or intellectually impaired preschool child, we provide readily transformable materials such as water, sand, finger paint. Of course, these materials are used by all preschool children, but the special needs child may engage in different activities with the materials and the teacher's responses and questions are based on the way the child interacts with the materials. A good learning environment encourages children to interact with materials in diverse ways, according to their developmental level, rather than imposing one way to use the materials.

Example: A normally developing four-year-old child will use sand to make "roads" for toy cars. A child still functioning at the sensorimotor level will be interested in filling and emptying containers of sand, but not in using the sand to represent something else.

Example: While a four- or five-year-old can make playdough from a picture-recipe chart, measuring the flour and water and salt and oil with measuring cups and spoons, a child who is developmentally two years old will enjoy manipulating the ingredients and transforming them into dough, but will not be able to decode the chart. In the same work/play group, a child with a hearing impairment might assist with some

of the steps requiring fine motor coordination (such as pouring) or quantitative concepts (using measuring cups).

The self-confidence and excitement of being able to contribute to the final result is very important to all children.

For children with language delays or impairments, the active concrete experiences provide a context and a reason to talk with others. In the course of such experiences, peers can act both as models and sources of reinforcement. Asking other children for materials or equipment, or describing what one has accomplished to the teacher are ideal ways to exercise the language a child is learning. This is language that is purposeful, social, and generalizable outside the classroom. Language in the speech clinic too often is removed from real experiences, from the need and joy of communication, and therefore, may not generalize to home and school situations. Encouraging a wide variety of representations, not just verbal, also means that children whose language lags behind their general cognitive development have a number of ways to make their feelings and ideas clearer: through art media, role play/pantomime, dance and movement, construction with blocks or with real carpentry tools and wood. This richness of materials and diversity of possibilities makes it possible for a child with sensory or perceptual deficits to find alternative means of initiating active transactions with the environment and with peers. The hearing impaired or visually impaired child is given incentives to interact with materials and with people; these children are invited by the environment to use both their impaired sensory channels and their normally-functioning ones.

2. Helping children to adopt a problem solving orientation

A second basic strategy, which complements the active-concrete learning and extension through language and representation, is a strategy of helping children to define goals, to discover problems in the process of trying to attain goals, and to explore and evaluate alternative solutions to a problem, whether

it is a problem involving objects or people. This problem solving orientation is an exciting one for teachers and parents to see developing in young children. It is all the more exciting when one sees it work for children with special needs.

Children experience a daily routine in the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum that asks them to make plans and choices. They learn from this that they can accomplish something if they first make a plan, and they also learn that they have explicit choices and alternatives. We have seen this approach generalize from the classroom to the home. We create environments in which teachers and parents learn that it is their job to help children encounter interesting (and solvable) problems.

> *Example: An emotionally disturbed boy, labeled "hyperactive" by some, exhibits long periods of focused attention and purposeful activity as he makes an airplane out of wood at the workbench. He chose to go to the workbench, and decided that he wanted to make an airplane. The teacher helped him to think about the materials, tools and procedures he would need. Later at "recall time" he drew the airplane and dictated a "story" about it in which he described what he did when the glue was not strong enough to hold the wings on the plane.*

Providing choices and a rich variety of developmentally appropriate materials is an alternative to the kind of environmental restriction conventionally prescribed for handicapped children. The notion that children with special needs require stimulus-lean environments may have evolved as a way of getting children to attend to highly structured tasks that are not developmentally appropriate and hence not interesting. This would explain why children seem to become "distracted" by other "stimuli" in such an environment.

The belief that special needs children require extrinsic reinforcers for participating in learning activities may also have grown out of settings that provide developmentally inappropriate activities. In most cases where children have been able to participate in a Cognitively Oriented group preschool program, it has been possible to find activities that are intrin-

sically motivating. The systematic use of "social reinforcers" has also been unnecessary, since these rewards occur naturally in an "open" preschool environment; the systematic record keeping and scheduling of reinforcers by the teachers has not been required. The children derive a sense of accomplishment from carrying out their own plans, rather than from pleasing the teacher.

3. Helping children move from here and now to there and then. From things to relations.

An approach which stresses active learning and choices must help teachers to support intellectual growth in many ways. Representation and conversation are ways to stretch young minds: In the process of talking about experience and representing them in several modalities (actions, drawings, models, etc.) children are consolidating their comprehension of events and building analytic and creative skills. Children learn relationships and pay increased attention to the structure of objects and events. A basic strategy teachers use in the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum is to move conversation and representational activities from the here and now to more remote events and places as children become more capable of dealing with the past and future and with spatially distant realities. This is part of an expansion of learning from things to relationships, comparisons, quantification. Some of the "key experiences" that contribute to this expansion are the following:

Spatial Relations

--Fitting things together and taking them apart.
--Rearranging a set of objects or one object in space (folding, twisting, stretching, stacking, tying) and observing the spatial transformations.
--Observing things and places from different spatial viewpoints.
--Experiencing and describing the positions of things in relation to each other (e.g., in the middle, on the side of; on, off, on top of, over, above).
--Experiencing and describing the direction of movement of things and people (to, from, into, out of, toward, away from).

--Experiencing and describing relative distances among things and locations (close, near, far, next to, apart, together).
--Experiencing and representing one's own body: how it is structured, what various body parts can do.
--Learning to locate things in the classroom, school, and neighborhood.
--Interpreting representations of spatial relations in drawings and pictures.
--Distinguishing and describing shapes.

Temporal Relations

--Planning and completing what one has planned.
--Describing and representing past events.
--Anticipating future events verbally and by making appropriate preparations.
--Starting and stopping an action on signal.
--Noticing, describing, and representing the order of events.
--Using conventional time units when talking about past and future events (morning, yesterday, hour, etc.).
--Comparing time periods (short, long; new, old; young, old; a little while, a long time).
--Observing that clocks and calendars are used to mark the passage of time.
--Observing seasonal changes.

Classification

--Investigating and labeling the attributes of things.
--Noticing and describing how things are the same and how they are different. Sorting and matching.
--Using and describing something in several different ways.
--Describing what characteristics something does *not* possess or what class it does not belong to.
--Holding more than one attribute in mind at a time. (Example: Can you find something that is red and made of wood?)
--Distinguishing between "some" and "all."

Seriation

--Comparing: Which one is bigger (smaller), heavier (lighter), rougher (smoother), louder (softer), longer (shorter), taller (shorter), wider (narrower), sharper, darker, etc.

--Arranging several things in order along some dimension and describing the relations (the longest one, the shortest one, etc.).

Number concepts

--Comparing number and amount: more/less, same amount; more/fewer, same number.
--Comparing the number of items in two sets by matching them up in one-to-one correspondence. (Example: are there as many crackers as there are children?)
--Enumerating (counting) objects, as well as counting by rote.

These experiences and concepts are an important bridge between physical encounters with the world and the kinds of abstract reasoning skills necessary for success in school. When special education programs attempt to teach school skills (e.g., alphabet recognition, clock or calendar reading, simple arithmetic) before the child has mastered the underlying spatial or temporal concepts upon which these skills are based, the result can only be frustration for the child or superficial or rote learning. Often academic skills are introduced to developmentally delayed children with the thought that the children will "look" normal if they can write their names, appear to understand the calendar, know right from left, etc. Rather than drill concepts not understood by the developmentally younger child, it makes more sense to provide the foundation upon which such concepts can later emerge more easily. Building up expectations about the flow of time in the daily routine (planning time, work time, cleanup time, recall time, etc.) is a useful step toward mastery of clocks and calendars, for example. Similarly, grouping materials in categories and making them easily accessible to the children can enhance their understanding of their environment. An organized daily routine and classroom environment can provide the predictability and stability that all children need if they are to be comfortable in an environment that invites choices and creativity.

The general strategies and key experiences described above are being used with all types of children, not just handicapped children. Thus, the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum has been shown to be a framework that can

serve as the basic tool for teachers working with integrated groups of handicapped and nonhandicapped children. The High/Scope Preschool and programs around the country which use this model, have demonstrated that a model which strives for developmental validity rather than remediation and attainment of specific objectives through didactic teaching, can best help to create learning environments that are both "least restrictive" and "most facilitative."

Evaluation Findings

We do have quantitative or "hard" evidence for the effectiveness of a developmental approach -- evidence that is striking because it includes longitudinal follow-up research:

- "Educably mentally retarded" children who attended the first preschool program which used the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum (The Perry Preschool in Ypsilanti, Michigan) scored significantly higher than a no-preschool control group on achievement tests given at the end of eighth grade. (Weikart, Bond, and McNeil, 1978)
- Children in the Cognitively Oriented preschool classes in Ypsilanti have consistently shown impressive test gains on IQ-type measures pre-to-post. In one study, for children who averaged 80 on the Stanford-Binet at the beginning of the year, there was an average 24 point IQ gain by the end of the program, and a sustained gain of 15 points five years after the end of the program. (Weikart, et al. 1978)
- Findings from the 1975-76 school year show that the handicapped children in the High/Scope Preschool experienced important gains. (Banet, Matz, et al. 1976) Pre- and post-testing with the McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities revealed that the children, as a group, advanced 2.02 months in mental age for each month in the High/Scope First Chance Demonstration Preschool. The gains of the variously handicapped children were equivalent to those of their non-handicapped peers.

These findings suggest that developmental preschool programs can produce measurable gains that endure over many years. These findings are as powerful a validation of the developmental approach as any outcome data in the preschool intervention literature.

Conclusion

The Cognitively Oriented Curriculum is one of many approaches serving young handicapped children in "open" environments. Continued research should shed more light on the applicability of developmental vs. diagnostic/corrective models and on issues relating to the structure of environments for young handicapped children. It is our strong belief that effective and developmentally appropriate programs for "normal" and for "special" children will turn out to be remarkably similar.

References

Banet, B., Matz, R. et al.: Program Performance Report, High/Scope BEH Demonstration Preschool Project (OEG-0-74-2720). 1976.

Hohmann, M. & Banet, B. with a foreword by Weikart, D. P. 1973. Young children in action. A manual for preschool educators. (In preparation), High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, Ypsilanti, Michigan.

Weikart, D. P., Rogers, L., Adcock, C. and McClelland, D. 1971. The cognitively oriented curriculum: A framework for preschool teachers. National Association for the Education of Young Children. Urbana, Ill. 182 p.

Weikart, D. P., Bond, J. T., and McNeil, J. T. 1978. The Ypsilanti Perry Preschool Project: Preschool years and longitudinal results through fourth grade. Monograph No. 3. High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, Ypsilanti, Michigan.

Weikart, D. P., Epstein, A., Schweinhart, L. and Bond, J. T. 1978. The Ypsilanti Preschool Curriculum Demonstration Project: Preschool years and longitudinal results. Monograph No. 4, High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, Ypsilanti, Michigan.

The Child Observation Record

The High/Scope Child Observation Record (COR) was developed during 1974-1975. It has been continually revised and expanded since then. The versions of the COR record form and manual that were used during 1976-77 are found on the following pages.The COR is a set of observation categories and rating scales for use by teachers in assessing child development within the context of the Cognitively Oriented Preschool Curriculum. The COR has the following characteristics:

- COR items describe behaviors that are relatively content-free, thereby guarding against the dangers of "teaching to the test."
- The observational categories help teachers focus attention on curriculum-relevant dimensions of child behavior.
- The observational categories provide measures of development not readily obtained by other assessment procedures.

During the course of the project, numerous trainees have used the COR to observe children in their classrooms.

HIGH/SCOPE EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH FOUNDATION
Copyright © 1976

CHILD OBSERVATION RECORD
Preschool - Kindergarten

Interim Revision - January, 1976

Please see the COR Manual for recommendations on gathering the necessary information and for definitions of observation categories.

Child's Name _____

Teacher's Name _____

Date of Observation Period _____
month/year

PLANNING TIME

Item 1: Complexity of Plan

1. Child gives no indication of having a plan in mind, stands around idly or follows the teacher around, not making any decision of his own. 1
2. Child points to, walks over to, or names an area, material, or child; but the teacher needs to "recognize" the plan. 2
3. With a lot of prompting from teacher, child describes what he is going to do 3
4. Without a lot of prompting from teacher, child describes what he is going to do 4
5. With a lot of prompting from teacher, child describes how he will carry out his plan 5
6. Without a lot of prompting from teacher, child describes how he will carry out his plan 6

CIRCLE ONE

WORK TIME

Item 2: Following Initial Plan

0. Child did not make an initial plan, so this item is inapplicable 0
1. Child does not follow initial plan 1
2. Child starts initial plan less than 3 out of 5 days 2
3. Child usually starts initial plan (at least 3 out of 5 days) 3

CIRCLE ONE

4. Child sometimes follows initial plan for at least 10 minutes, sticking with the original goal even when introducing slight modifications, such as moving to a different area of the room ("sometimes" means once or twice out of 5 days). 4
5. Child usually follows initial plan (at least 3 days out of 5), sticking with the original goal even when introducing slight modifications, such as moving to a different area of the room. 5

Item 3: Long-Term Projects

1. Child engages in long-term projects . . . . . 1 CIRCLE IF APPLICABLE

Item 4: Problem-Solving with Materials

1. Child seldom perceives or confronts problems. . . 1
2. Child perceives and confronts but does not seriously attempt to solve problems . . . . . 2 CIRCLE ONE
3. Child seriously attempts to solve problems but is not insistent. 3
4. Child seriously attempts to solve problems and is insistent. 4

Item 5: Focused Activity

1. Child focuses on one project for less than 10 minutes at a time. 1
2. Child focuses on one project for 10-30 minutes at a time . . . . . 2 CIRCLE ONE
3. Child focuses on one project for 30 minutes or more 3

Item 6: Spontaneous Representation Using Materials

1. Child engages only in object level play 1
2. Child creates representations usually with little detail 2
3. Child creates representations that sometimes have some detail. 3
4. Child creates representations that usually have some detail. . . . . 4 CIRCLE ONE
5. Child creates representations that sometimes have great detail 5
6. Child creates representations that usually have great detail 6

Item 7: Spontaneous Representation in Dramatic Play

0.	Not observed. 0	
1.	Child uses one object to stand for another. . . . 1	
2.	Child uses actions or sounds to pretend to be doing something 2	
3.	Child uses words to set stage 3	
4.	Child assumes role of someone else (5+ minutes) . 4	CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY
5.	Inanimate objects used as characters in child's dramatic play 5	
6.	Child talks in language appropriate to role . . . 6	
7.	Child coordinates role play with peers (5+ minutes). 7	

RECALLING AND REPRESENTING WORK TIME ACTIVITIES

Item 8: Recall without objects present

		Verbal	Gestural	
1.	Child is unable to recall anything he did.	1	1'	
2.	Child sometimes names something he did. .	2	2'	
3.	Child usually names something he did. . .	3	3'	
4.	Child sometimes provides some detail about what he did	4	4'	CIRCLE ONE
5.	Child usually provides some detail about what he did	5	5'	
6.	Child sometimes provides great detail about what he did	6	6'	
7.	Child usually provides great detail about what he did	7	7'	

Item 9: Representation Through Art Media

1.	Child does not use art media to represent what he did 1	
2.	Child sometimes creates representations but with little detail. 2	
3.	Child usually creates representations but without detail. 3	
4.	Child sometimes creates representations with some detail 4	CIRCLE ONE
5.	Child usually creates representations with some detail 5	
6.	Child sometimes creates representations with great detail. 6	
7.	Child usually creates representations with great detail. 7	

SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Item 10: Social Adjustment and Autonomy

1. Child appears to enjoy being in the company of peers and does not, as a rule, shun them or purposely hurt them to keep them away. 1
2. Peers appear to like the child, are not afraid of him, don't ignore him or treat him as a push-over. 2
3. Child succeeds in getting peers' attention in ways that his own subculture would find acceptable and that are not disruptive to the classroom 3
4. Child does not shun social interaction, does not back off when children or adults approach him 4
5. Child actively and purposefully seeks out interactions with peers 5
6. Child is willing to take turns when the need occurs. 6
7. Child spontaneously allows other children to share his materials, to use some of whatever he is using. 7
8. Child participates in all-group activities. . . . 8
9. Child joins others in activities that involve agreed-upon rules 9
10. Child settles disagreements verbally rather than physically 10
11. Child settles disagreements without teacher's help. 11
12. Child attempts to help and/or cheer children who are unhappy, sick, or hurt. 12
13. Child is not vindictive - does not enjoy hurting others. 13
14. Child asserts own rights to share or to fair play in socially acceptable ways. 14
15. Child is able to apply diverse strategies in social problem-solving. 15
16. Child gets adult's attention in ways that are acceptable for his age and which do not involve breaking the rules of the classroom 16
17. Child does not seek constant reassurance. 17
18. Child does not seek constant praise or other reward from teacher 18
19. Child makes an effort to follow the rules of the classroom, does not purposely break them. . .19
20. Child is active and not disruptive. 20

CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY

Item 11: Peer Interaction

1. Child usually works and plays by himself. . . . 1
2. Child sometimes interacts with other children but his interaction is not sustained 2
3. Child sometimes works with other children toward a common goal. 3

CIRCLE ONE

Item 12: Pride in Work

0. Teacher cannot tell whether child destroys what he makes because of lack of pride or because he is experimenting 0
1. Child frequently demeans, hides, and/or destroys what he does or makes. 1
2a. Child shows little or no pride in what he makes (either by verbal or body language) even when someone else calls attention to it. . 2a
2b. Child acts proud of what he does and makes, but the teacher has reason to believe that the pride is not genuine. 2b
2c. Child acts proud of what he does and makes, but only after someone has called attention to and/or praised it. 2c
3. Regardless of whether or not he is praised for his work, the child's body and/or verbal language make it clear that he is proud of his efforts. 3

CIRCLE ONE

COMMUNICATION SKILLS

Item 13: Writing

1. Child shows no interest in the process of writing 1
2. Child shows some interest in and understanding of the writing process (watches teacher take dictation, asks teacher to take dictation). 2
3. Child attempts to or pretends to write but the "letters" are often squiggles, bearing little or no resemblance to real letters 3
4. Child attempts to trace letters and words . . . 4

CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY

5. Child attempts to copy. 5
6. Child has begun to write down clearly recognized letters with or without help from the teacher 6
7. Child has begun to write down clearly recognizable words with or without help from the teacher 7

Item 14: Reading

0. Not observed. 0
1. Child shows no interest in the process of reading 1
2. Child shows some interest in reading and understanding of the reading process (listens to teacher read dictation, asks teacher to read dictation). 2
3. Child matches letters and words that are alike 3
4. Child identifies some words 4
5. Child attempts to read his own dictation. 5

CIRCLE AL THAT APPL

Item 15: Verbal Communication Skill

1. Child communicates nonverbally. 1
2. Child communicates using single words, but his speech is often difficult to interpret because of problems with articulation and/or phonation (voice) 2
3. Child communicates using single words 3
4. Child communicates using single phrases and sentences, but his speech is often difficult to interpret because of problems with articulation and/or phonation (voice). 4
5. Child communicates using single phrases and sentences 5
6. Child communicates fluently 6

CIRCLE ONE

HIGH/SCOPE EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH FOUNDATION

Copyright © 1976

CHILD OBSERVATION RECORD MANUAL

Interim Revision - January, 1976

Recommendations for Completing the Form

Please read through the Child Observation Record (COR) and this manual before beginning your observations. Each COR refers to a time period of five consecutive days in school (with allowance for absences, vacations, and weekends). In other words, each time a teacher completes a COR for a child, that COR will refer to a five day period. For some items, the teacher is asked to check "the highest level of behavior that is characteristic." In this case, the term "characteristic" means that the behavior occurred on at least three of the five days to which the COR refers.

Some other items ask the teacher to check the level that is most typical of the child's behavior during the observation period. In this case the phrase "most typical" refers to the level of behavior at which the child most often is operating.

Evidence for the child's level of behavior may be drawn only from what one of the classroom teachers has personally observed. While it may be important for the teacher's child planning to know that the child behaves differently at home than at school, the COR refers only to behaviors observed by the teacher.

Definitions of Observation Categories

PLANNING TIME

Item 1: Complexity of Plan

- Check the highest level of behavior that is characteristic.

  1. Child does not make a plan before he begins working. This includes all children who do not give any indication during planning time of what they want to do. During work time they may or may not engage in some activity.

2. Child indicates verbally or nonverbally an area, material, or another child with whom he will play. This includes all children who indicate the direction in which they will move once planning time is over but who do not indicate what they are going to do. Examples of level 2 planning:

   - Child points to block area.
   - Child says "trucks."
   - Child points to another child.
   - Child says "play with Donna."

3. Child says something about what he is going to do but only with prompting from the teacher. Child does not seem to already have a clear idea of what he is going to do but develops his plan with prompting from teacher. Example of level 3 planning:

   T: "What would you like to do today?"
   C: "Go to the art area."
   T: "And what do you think you'd like to do in the art area?"
   C: "I don't know."
   T: "Well, can you think of some things you could do in the art area? What could you do there?"
   C: "Paint."
   T: "Anything else?"
   C: "Make something with playdoh."
   T: "Is there anything special that you would like to do in the art area today?"
   C: "Make cookies out of playdoh."

4. Child says something about what he is going to do without prompting from the teacher. Child seems to already have an idea of what he is going to do and describes his plan with minimal prompting. Examples of level 4 planning:

   T: "What are you going to do today?"
   C: "I'm going to play fireman."

   OR

   T: "What are you going to do today?"
   C: "I'm going to the block area."
   T: "And what are you going to do in the block area?"
   C: "Build a castle."

5. Child describes how he is going to do what he has planned with prompting from teacher. Describing "how" might include saying something about:

   - The steps involved in making or doing something.
   - The ways in which different materials will be combined.

- What could be used to stand for something else.
- The role attributes of a person or thing the child will pretend to be.

Children in this category need a lot of prompting from their teacher in thinking through "how" they can do "what" they have planned. Example of level 5 planning:

T: "What are you going to do today?"
C: "I'm going to be a fireman in the house area."
T: "What are you going to do when you're a fireman?"
C: "I don't know."
T: "Remember the firemen we saw at the fire station? What were they doing?"
C: "Washing."
T: "That's right. They were washing the fire truck. Anything else?"
C: "Cooking."
T: "Upstairs they had a kitchen where they were cooking lunch. Now can you think of anything you can do when you are a fireman?"
C: "Yeah. I'm going to wash my truck and cook some food and then put out a fire."

6. Child describes how he is going to do what he has planned without a lot of prompting from his teacher. Example of level 6 planning:

T: "What are you going to do today?"
C: "Build a big house."
T: "That's a good idea. What kind of things are you going to use to make your big house?"
C: "Blocks for the sides and tinkertoys for the top."
T: "That sounds like a neat house. Will you be able to go inside it?"
C: "Yeah. I can have a door and blocks inside for chairs."
T: "Can I come visit you when it's finished?"
C: "Yeah."

Although the teacher provides some prompts for the child in this example, she does not have to help the child formulate his ideas.

WORK TIME

Item 2: Following Initial Plan

- Check the highest level of behavior that is characteristic. Although following through on a complex plan is more advanced that following through on a simple plan, the observer is asked to assess the degree to which a child follows his initial plan whether it is simple or complex.

  Finally, the observer should disregard instance in which a child is unable to follow his initial plan due to circumstances beyond his control (e.g., other children are already using essential materials, tools, or space).

  If a child's initial plan is revised and extended, the child is considered still to be working on his initial plan. For instance, if the child's initial plan was to play with a truck in the block area, the child's decision to go to the house area to wash the truck could be considered an extention of his initial plan, as long as he actually did wash the truck.

  1. Child does not follow his initial plan. Instead he does something entirely different during work time.

  2. Child sometimes gets started on his initial plan, but just as often he does something entirely different during work time.

  3. Child usually gets started on his initial plan but typically does not complete it. If a child plans simply to work in an area, with another child or a material he would be scored 3 if he spends less than 10 minutes in the area or with the child or material he indicated.

  4. Child sometimes completes his plan but just as often abandons it before completion.

  5. Child usually follows his initial plan until it is completed. He does basically what he said he would do before making a new plan. If a child plans simply to work in an area or with another child or material he would be scored 5 if he spends more than 10 minutes in the area or with the child or material he indicated.

Item 3: Long Term Projects

- Check if the child has undertaken a project lasting for more than one work time since last evaluation. This item should only be checked when a child makes a plan to finish something begun on a previous day and picks up where he/she left off. In other words, there must be evidence 1) that the child conceptualizes a project which has an end point, 2) that the child considers the project incomplete, and 3) that the child intends to complete it. A child who repeatedly engages in the same activity (perhaps elaborating a representational theme) would not be checked on this item.

Item 4: Problem-Solving with Material

- Check the level that is most typical of the child's behavior during the observation period. Problems which are social in origin are not included here. Only problems that are encountered while working with materials should be considered. Problems arise when goal realization is impeded.

  1. Child's activity is not characteristically goal-oriented. Consequently problems are not frequently perceived and confronted while working with materials.

  2. Child perceives and confronts problems while working with materials but does not make a serious independent effort to solve problems in order to realize goals. Instead the child: (1) quickly abandons the activity, (2) redefines the goals in order to eliminate the problem or (3) seeks a deus ex machina solution by directly calling upon the teacher or indirectly soliciting help by vocally or physically exhibiting extreme frustration.

  3. Child perceives, confronts, and makes a serious attempt to solve problems that stand in the way of goal realization. However, the child is usually not insistent upon solving problems. Instead, the child will eventually redefine the goals of the activity or change activities. In short, the child appears to be interested in problem-solving but is not usually so goal-oriented that problems "must" be solved.

4. Child perceives, confronts and makes a serious independent effort to solve problems that stand in the way of goal realization. If the child is unable to solve the problem alone, he/she then effectively enlists teacher or peers either to help implement an independently hypotnesized solution or to give advice.

Item 5: Focused Activity

- Check the highest level of behavior that is characteristic. When a child is engaged in focused activity, he/she is attending closely to what he is doing. It is not necessary for an activity to be described in a child's plan for his/her activity during work time to be focused.

  Focused activity may involve changing areas and substituting materials as long as the child continues to be psychologically involved. In other words, the verb "focus" should be taken to denote a theme or project rather than remaining in an area. Thus, a child who remains within an area for 10 minutes would not be considered to be focused for 10 minutes unless he had stayed with one project for 10 minutes. Conversely, a child who changed areas to extend a project could be considered to have remained focused.

  This scale is intended to differentiate children who frequently change activities and/or lack focus in their activity from children who engage in sustained focused activity.

  1. Child does not engage in focused activity at all or engages in focused activities for less than 10 minutes at a time.

  2. Child usually engages in focused activity for 10 to 30 minutes at a time.

  3. Child usually engages in focused acticity for 30 minutes or more.

Item 6: Spontaneous Representation Using Materials

- Check the level that is most typical of the child's behavior during the observation period. This item measures the complexity of whatever representations a child creates during work time. This item does not measure the frequency with which a child creates representations.

Complexity or the degree of detail in a child's representation is the degree to which the child differentiates parts of the thing he is representing and the degree to which he represents specific attributes and spatial relations of the thing he is representing. The observer should focus on complexity in the child's representation, not accuracy.

For a representation to be judged on Item 6, the representation needs to have an element of realism. That is, there should be some agreement possible among observers on what the representation stands for. Of course, some children may be able to give detailed verbal descriptions of abstract representations. (For instance, a child may paint a series of different colored horizontal stripes across a paper and describe the representation as "a lake with a boat and waves and sky and a man rowing in a bathing suit while his girl friend is fishing.") However, judging these types of representations is too tricky. Therefore, the teacher should attempt to see what type of representation the child is capable of producing when the child is attempting a realistic reproduction. To achieve this goal, a useful strategy during the observation period might be to channel the child's activity towards the reproduction of a perceptually present object or event. Another strategy might be to channel the child's activity towards the production of a functional object such as a roadway (with blocks). Remember, though, that for this item, the child must begin the representation process spontaneously, on the child's own. The representation may make use of any materials in the classroom.

1. Child engages only in object level play. He explores the properties of materials but does not use them representationally.

2. When the child creates representations, they usually have little detail.

3. When the child creates representations, they sometimes have some detail.

4. When the child creates representations, they usually have some detail.

5. When the child creates representations, they sometimes have great detail.

6. When the child creates representations, they usually have great detail.

Item 7: Spontaneous Representation in Dramatic Play

- Check all behaviors observed. This item measures the complexity of whatever dramatic play the child engages in. It does not measure the frequency with which a child engages in dramatic play.

  1. Child uses one object to stand for another.
  2. Child uses actions or sounds to pretend to be doing something.
  3. Child uses words to represent a make-believe situation, i.e., to "set the stage."
  4. Child pretends to be someone or something else for a significant period of time (5 or more minutes). Child assumes role behaviors not merely role label.
  5. Inanimate objects are used as characters in the child's dramatic play. For example, the child acts out drama using dolls, toy animals, etc. as characters, rather than himself assuming a role.
  6. Child talks within the context of the dramatic play situation. Child stays "in character" while talking with others and uses language appropriate to the role.
  7. Child coordinates role play with another child for a significant period of time (5 or more minutes). Coordinated role play involves both children. Both children actively assume roles and mutually determine situations and interactions.

RECALLING AND REPRESENTING WORK TIME ACTIVITIES

Item 8: Verbal Recall (without objects present)

- Check the highest level of behavior that is characteristic. The degree of detail is defined by the degree to which the child sequences events, describes parts and spatial relations, describes the role of other participants, and explains decisions he made. This item assesses the child's ability to describe what he has done during work time without visual reference to anything he made or used.

Notice that there are two sets of numbers for scoring this item. If the child's preferred mode of representation is gestural, performance should be scored under the column labeled Gestural. However, the representation must be of work time activity in either case.

If filling out the COR during the first week or so of school, before the child really knows what "work time" is, ask him to tell what he was doing before clean up time, or after planning time, or something else that gives him a meaningful referent.

1. Child is unable to recall anything he did during work time unless the teacher reminds him of what he was doing.

2. Child is sometimes able to name something he did or used or someone with whom he played during work time.

3. Child is usually able to name something he did or used or someone with whom he played during work time.

4. Child is sometimes able to recall a few details of what he did during work time.

5. Child is usually able to recall a few details of what he did during work time.

6. Child is sometimes able to recall what he did in great detail during work time.

7. Child is usually able to recall what he did in great detail during work time.

Item 9: Representation through Art Media

- Check the level that is most characteristic of the child's behavior during the observation period. Representation through art media should be observed during periods when the teacher has provided a clear opportunity for children to represent their work time or field trip experiences. In the case of kindergarten, teachers may directly request children to represent their work time experiences through art media. The

complexity or degree of detail in a child's representation is the degree to which the child differentiates parts of the thing he is representing and the degree to which the child represents specific attributes and spatial relations of the thing he is representing. The observer should focus on complexity in the child's representation, not accuracy.

The complexity of a child's verbal description of her representation should not influence the scoring of the representation. (See Item 6, paragraph 3.)

1. Child does not use art media to represent what he has done or experienced during work time or on field trips.

2. Child sometimes creates representations, but they usually lack detail.

3. Child usually creates representations, but they usually lack detail.

4. Child sometimes creates representations that have some detail.

5. Child usually creates representations that have some detail.

6. Child sometimes creates representations that have great detail.

SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Item 10: Social Adjustment and Autonomy

- Check all behaviors that occur at least 75% of the time when the situation allows.

1. No further definition.

2. No further definition.

3. Getting a child's attention by grabbing his arm, for instance, may be acceptable according to the behavior patterns of a particular sub-culture. Such behavior would indicate a check for number 3, as long as the behavior did not create problems in the classroom.

4. No further definition.

5. Child seeks out interactions with other children, i.e., is an initiator as well as a responder.

6. Child is able to wait her turn and give someone else his turn.

7. No further definition.

8. Child participates in all-group, teacher-led activities such as circle time; doesn't withdraw from or disrupt the group.

9. Child joins others in activities that involve agreed-upon rules. These activities may include role play, circle time games such as following the instructions on a record, playing catch, etc. (The rules need not be as highly structured as those for playing marbles, or hide and seek, for examples.)

10. No further definition.

11. Child is able to settle most disagreements without calling on the teacher for help. Settling a disagreement does not mean just giving in to someone else without complaining.

12. No further definition.

13. No further definition.

14. No further definition.

15. Child is able to apply diverse strategies in social problem-solving. When one tack does not work, she takes another.

16. No further definition.

17. Child does not seek constant reassurance from the teacher but is relatively independent.

18. Child does not seek constant praise or other rewards from the teachers but is intrinsically motivated in large part.

19. No further definition.

20. Child is active and not disruptive. His behavior does not cause teachers to be, in their own opinion, very concerned about him, about his future, etc.

Item 11: Peer Interaction

- Check the highest level of behavior that has been observed.

1. Child usually works or plays by himself or with the teacher. He may work near other children but seldom if ever initiates interactions with them.

2. Child sometimes interacts socially with other children as he works or plays, perhaps briefly joining in their play or helping them but his interaction is not sustained.

3. Child sometimes works together with other children toward a common goal, mutually solving problems and making decisions as they arise. Examples:

   - sustained coordination of role play
   - building something together
   - playing a child-initiated game that requires the cooperation of two or more children

Item 12: Pride in Work

- Circle the highest level of behavior that is characteristic.

0. No further description.

1. The child frequently demeans and/or destroys what he does or makes:

   - The child who says, "Mine isn't any good."

   - The child who destroys what he makes: knocks down block structures in anger, in disgust, or nonchalantly, but not in fun; tears up paintings because they, "aren't any good,"; is embarrassed to take things home or show them to other children; etc.

2a. The child shows little or no pride in his work but does not seem to view it either negatively or positively. Little or no evidence that child treats his work or products as an "expression of himself." The developmentally young child is most likely to receive this rating.

2b. Child acts proud of what he does and makes, but the teacher has reason to believe that the pride is not genuine. That is, the real purpose of the child's show of pride is to gain attention.

2c. No further definition.

3. The child views his actions and products as "his," and he is generally proud of them.

COMMUNICATION SKILLS

Item 13: Writing

- Check all behaviors that apply. Although one would not expect preschool children to be engaged in writing their own plans or stories, one might expect children to show a growing interest in the process of writing through watching teachers write down their dictated stories, and by asking teachers to take dictation.

1. Child shows no interest in the process of writing. The child gives no indication that he understands what the teacher is doing when she writes down his plan or experience story and does not pay particular attention to the teacher's writing activity. Although the child may enjoy making verbal plans and telling about what he had done or experienced, he does not ask the teacher to write down what he says.

2. The child shows some interest in and understanding of the process of writing. He asks the teacher to write down what he says, and he watches as she writes it down.

3. No further definition.

4. Child has begun to trace letters and words in his own plans and stories which the teacher has written down.

5. Child has begun to copy letters and words that appear in his own plans and stories which the teacher has written down.

6. No further definition.

7. No further definition.

Item 14: Reading

- Check all behaviors that apply. Although one would not expect preschool children to be engaged in reading their own plans and stories one might expect children to show a growing interest in the process of reading through listening to teachers read back their dictated plans and stories, or by asking the teacher to read their own dictations.

  0. No further definition.

  1. Child shows no understanding of the process of reading. The child does not seem to understand that the plans and stories the teacher has written down are permanently recorded and can be read back as they were told. He does not ask the teacher to read back what she has written down, and he may not even pay particular attention when his own dictation is read back.

  2. Child shows some interest in and understanding of the reading process. The child asks the teacher to read back his own dictation. He listens to what is said and gives some indication that he recognizes the plan or story as his own.

  3. Child begins to match letters and words that are alike in his plans and stories the teacher has written down. He may also match letters and words that are alike in other reading materials.

  4. Child begins to identify some words in his plans and stories the teacher has written down. He may also identify words in other reading materials.

  5. Child begins to read his own dictated plans and stories and perhaps other reading materials.

Item 15: Communication Skill

- Check the highest level of behavior that is characteristic.

  1. Child communicates nonverbally using gestures and unintelligible sounds.

  2. No further definition.

3. Child communicates using single words which are understandable and appropriate to the situation.

4. No further definition.

5. Child communicates using single phrases or sentences. His language is simple and sparse, but what he says is understandable and appropriate to the situation.

6. Child communicates fluently. His speech is complex, extensive, and understandable. He uses phrases, simple sentences, and complex sentences appropriate to the situation. He makes statements which are more than one sentence long.

Reprint from Annual Report, 1974-75, High/Scope Foundation

Directions in Teacher Training

BERNARD BANET

THE HIGH/SCOPE FOUNDATION has been developing and demonstrating an approach to the education of young children based on the assumption that purposeful teaching and student-initiated learning can be compatible. Teams of educators and researchers are working to apply theoretical advances in developmental psychology to the practical business of constructing educational frameworks for children. A related challenge has been keeping a number of us occupied for several years: the development of a training "model" for teachers, paraprofessionals and child care workers that parallels the philosophy and methods we employ with children. The dissemination of the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum through the preparation of teachers has become as important to us as questions about how and what children should learn.

The Foundation's involvement in training began in 1968 - 69 when we were asked to implement the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum in two federal compensatory education projects—Planned Variation Head Start and Follow Through. The agencies responsible for these projects wanted the curriculum "installed" in a dozen or so locations around the country. It was clear to us that the curriculum could not be conveyed to these sites through the mails. We were not offering a "package" or a "kit," a set of curriculum materials for children or a "teacher proof" script for the classroom staff to pull off the shelf and enact. What we were offering was a way of thinking about learning and teaching that required face-to-face contact with teachers. When we were asked to work in Follow Through and Head Start it was our ideas about curriculum for *children* that attracted attention, but these ideas had to be transmitted gradually and concretely to *teachers* if the program was to work.

In moving from a program for children to a program for adults, we have retained the coherent framework of goals and methods with which we began—the cognitively oriented "open framework." An advantage of basing teacher training or staff development on one coherent approach rather than on an eclectic stew is that this is a way to increase the internal consistency of program methods and goals. A comprehensive curriculum framework provides a basis for discussion and decision-making of a problem-solving rather than a merely problem-noting kind. It provides a clear set of goals and strategies that can be used in making instructional decisions.

Of course High/Scope does not have the only coherent model for preschool or elementary education, or the only "teaching agenda" for infants and toddlers. The specific characteristics of the Foundation's curriculum for children, however, shape the kind of training program we are trying to create for adults and make it, perhaps, unique. As an open framework, the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum provides a teacher with long-term goals for children having to do with basic thinking or problem-solving processes. The teaching staff must commit themselves to these long-term goals as well as to the means for achieving them. They must, for example, come to value independence and purposefulness in their students, and in so doing they must learn how to provide opportunities for active learning while encouraging children to take a major part in planning their own learning experiences.

The training program begins with the following question: How can the teaching staff provide the key experiences most supportive of learning and development for each child, based on a set of possible strategies rather than a predetermined "validated" set of materials for children? The curriculum provides heuristics not algorithms. An example of the strategies that we are asking teachers to make a part of their course of action with preschool-age children appears below.

Bernard Banet is director of the Preschool Education Department.

TEACHING STRATEGIES FOR REPRESENTATION

Key Experience 3: **Relating pictures, photographs, and models to real places and things**

A. Provide models of real objects, events, and people children experience in the classroom, on field trips, and at home.

   For example: rubber people, zoo animals, farm animals, wooden dollhouse furniture, child-sized play stove, sink, refrigerator, vehicles of all kinds, dolls, child-sized broom, dust pan.

B. Compare models of objects to the real object. How is the rubber rabbit like the real rabbit? How is it different? How is the play store in the House Area similar to the one we visited last week? How is it different?

C. Take photographs of children and their work during field trips and during the classroom day. Make these available for the children to look at whenever they wish.

D. Have books with pictures and photographs available in the classroom for children to look at whenever they choose. Give children the opportunity to "read" the pictures to you as you look at the books and read with them.

E. After a field trip, provide pictures for the classroom of the objects and places the children have experienced. Discuss these pictures with children; ask open-ended questions: "What can you tell me about this picture?"

F. Add new picture books and reading materials to the school library about a recent field trip.

G. Take photographs of objects in the classroom and compare the picture to the real object. How are they similar? How are they different?

H. Add old catalogs and magazines with pictures to the Art Area. Talk with children about pictures they have cut out.

A training program that provides goals and strategies rather than specific classroom materials has certain obvious difficulties. It cannot be learned quickly; the competencies cannot be mastered in preservice training, before the teacher has actually encountered children in the classroom. A corollary is that teacher training in this program is a long-term continuous process—so much more than a workshop here, a seminar there, or a sprinkling of discrete concepts that remain unrooted in a practical vision.

Making this training process work requires a commitment of effort and resources which not every school, Head Start or daycare center or parent-child program can make. Ongoing inservice training is expensive in terms of dollars and time. The role of "curriculum assistant"—in our jargon, the person who is responsible for inservice training in a particular classroom, school or school district—is not always built into school programs, and even where funds are available for ongoing training and supervision, the curriculum assistant often lacks a structure within which to work. We wish to arm the curriculum assistant or teacher trainer with a set of materials, both audio-visual and print, that can introduce new concepts or issues effectively to the teacher in training. Training "modules" are being developed for this purpose. In a typical training module:

- A rationale for the trainee, including the competencies to be learned and the reason for their importance, is presented.
- Criteria for the attainment of the competency are developed.
- Information about child development principles as applied in the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum is presented in print and through audio-visual media.
- Classroom application of the relevant concepts and competencies is demonstrated through audio-visual media supplemented by print.
- Video clips or other examples of teacher or child behaviors are presented for evaluation by the trainee according to new concepts learned in the training sequence.
- Observation guides or other evaluation instruments are provided for the trainee to use in the classroom, and for the trainer to use with the trainee. Feedback is given by the trainer.
- Other activities are provided in a trainer's guide. These include workshop activities, microteaching exercises, simulation and team planning discussions.

The trainer or curriculum assistant must master training competencies that are distinct from the skills needed to work with children, although classroom teaching experience in the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum is also essential.

Our Elementary Department is currently experimenting with a competency profile which may be fed back to the trainee by the trainer or used by the trainer alone as an aid to defining individual training needs. The Preschool Department has often used the strategy of encouraging trainees to define training needs for themselves by observing video clips of children in their classes. The issue becomes not "Am I a competent teacher?" but "What kinds of experiences are children in my class having? How can I improve the learning experiences for these children?" The objective is to have trainer and trainee mutually define needs for further work, rather than to have the trainer summarily prescribe further training experiences.

Since our training is mostly inservice and since it continues over a long period of time, we get very clear feedback about whether we are speaking to the needs of the classroom team. We know when our training is being translated into behavior and when it is not. While no one can give a complete behavioral definition of good teaching, it is possible to evaluate with some precision whether a teacher is using the High/Scope framework by observing the teacher in action. The possibility of such judgments and the fact that the criteria can be explicitly stated means that our training staff can cooperate effectively with a teaching staff; the danger of conflicting advice and philosophies can be minimized, and teachers can be given clear messages about what is expected and feedback which is relatively free of arbitrary value judgments.

In keeping with the curriculum philosophy, High/Scope quality assurance procedures stress process evaluations rather than student outcomes over short periods of time. There are those who feel that an effective teacher training program must include direct feedback to the teacher on the short-term learning outcomes demonstrated by students. In that view a teacher is "competent" or not according to what his students have learned. We do monitor many student "outcomes" informally and through systematic testing, but we do not view the best learning situation as one in which the teacher is obliged to have students demonstrate specific behavior changes over short periods of time. We prefer to hold the teacher "accountable" for the breadth of experiences children have and the extent to which the children are helped to accomplish their own plans.

Like the curriculum for children, which invites both teachers and students to initiate learning activities, the evolving training model invites choices of particular activities on the part of the trainee in the context of long-range goals developed by the trainer. Good teacher training, as we see it, is very much a problem-solving process enlisting the trainee's creativity and intellect. It is vitally important that the training support the trainee's strengths rather than stress his weaknesses; it should be an experience which enhances self-esteem as mastery is accomplished, just as we expect children to feel good about themselves as they realize goals they have set. We are still learning how best to build into this process an explicit openness to the trainee's needs, talents, interests, skills and learning style. Given a set of training objectives and a group of trainees, it can be tempting to sequence a set of learning activities for the entire group to make sure that all the objectives are "covered" or on the other hand to "individualize" the training so much that the long-range objectives are not systematically approached.

The most successful inservice training the Foundation has conducted combines several kinds of learning experiences for those in training: feedback from a curriculum assistant based on classroom observation; workshops; use of multi-media modules; experience observing a demonstration classroom or teaching in the Staff Training and Curriculum Development Center; experience working alongside a "master teacher"; team teaching with someone who is also learning the model. For a school or school district to do all this would require time and space for planning and evaluating each day and for meetings with the curriculum assistant. It would also require active support from the school principal and from the school district and community as a whole. Where such support is forthcoming, schools using the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum can expect enduring and important changes in the way teachers, parents and children regard themselves and education.

MULTI-MEDIA TRAINING PACKAGES

- Jan Diamondstone

The Special Project aimed to create a replicable training model based on a replicable early childhood curriculum framework.

The key elements in the replicability of the training model are the teacher's manual, trainer's manual, and audio-visual materials. These three components mesh with one another to create multi-media learning packages for the training of preschool teachers in the implementation of the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum.

Teacher's Manual

During 1973-77 the High/Scope Foundation Preschool Department, with funds partially provided by the High/Scope BEH Special Project for the Preparation of Preschool Specialists, prepared a new curriculum manual to assist teachers in applying the High/Scope preschool curriculum framework. This manual supplements an earlier publication, The Cognitively Oriented Curriculum by Weikart, Rogers, Adcock, and McClelland. (National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1971.)

A field review edition of the new manual, entitled the Cognitively Oriented Preschool Curriculum was circulated to five hundred people in 1976-77. Recipients included the field site trainees and curriculum assistants, and curriculum specialists at various universities.

The new teacher's manual, which will be titled Young Children in Action (by Mary Hohmann, Bernard Banet and David P. Weikart) in its final form, will be the central reference for High/Scope's training system. Each learning package has a print component consisting of chapters or sections in the teacher's manual. The table of contents of the field draft edition is found on the following pages. The final version will have additional materials on children with special needs, bilingual/bicultural programs, and program evaluation. Comments from reviewers are being used in creating the final edition of the teacher's manual.

From Field Draft Edition, The Cognitively Oriented Preschool Curriculum: Teacher's Manual

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1. An Introduction to the High/Scope Cognitively Oriented Preschool Curriculum 1

Chapter 2. The Child Development Theory Behind the Cognitively Oriented Preschool Curriculum 19

Chapter 3. Arranging and Equipping A Cognitively Oriented Preschool Classroom 39

Chapter 4. Establishing the Daily Routine in a Cognitively Oriented Preschool Curriculum 91

Chapter 5. Active Learning 183

Chapter 6. Language. 209

Chapter 7. Experiencing and Representing 229

Chapter 8. Classification 263

Chapter 9. Seriation and Number 311

Chapter 10. Space 345

Chapter 11. Time. 391

Chapter 12. Feelings 423

Chapter 13. The Role of the Teaching Team in the Cognitively Oriented Classroom 439

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Facts About the High/Scope Foundation

Appendix B. Choosing a Preschool Model

Appendix C. Key Experiences for Preschool Children

Appendix D. General Teaching Strategies for Adults

Appendix E. Preschool Teacher Training Profile

Appendix F. Child Observation Record and Child Observation Record Manual

Appendix G. Foundation Projects - Past & Present

Trainer's Manual

All the audio-visual training materials, the workshop activities, observation guides, interaction documentation systems, the variety of assessment instruments (for both teachers and children) and the variety of training techniques utilized in the project have been collected and organized into a comprehensive training program in the Trainer's Manual.

Chapters in the Trainer's Manual are related to and coordinated with chapters in the Teacher's Manual. For each chapter one or more training sequences are identified, each including: pre-workshop assignments and activities, workshop activities, materials and sample agendas, classroom follow-up procedures, and pre- and post-workshop assessments. The Table of Contents, which is included in the report, indicates the scope and intent of the manual.

Workshop descriptions include a statement of objectives and expectations for participants, prerequisites if any are called for, and a list of all the materials to gather (media and print materials, equipment, hand-outs etc.)

The manual includes scripts for all audio-visual materials, trainer's guides which may suggest discussion questions and issues, answer sheets for all observation guides recommended in the workshop sessions, and for all verbal and written assessment instruments, "masters" for all workshop handouts, and suggestions for alternative activities, materials, or procedures if the recommended ones are not available or relevant.

In short, the Trainer's Manual captures the ten years of experience H/S has amassed in developing systematic competency-based approaches to the training of teachers in an open framework approach to early childhood education.

Just as the curriculum for children is not teacher-proof - that is, that it does not bypass the critical decision-making role of the teacher - the training package for teachers is not trainer-proof in that it does not present a pre-determined programmed sequence of experiences through which all teachers are mechanistically routed. The purpose of the Trainer's Manual is to provide individuals in a training role with concrete suggestions, materials and procedures so that they will be able to carry out a comprehensive and systematic training program appropriate for the local center or school district/system.

Good teacher training is a mutual problem-solving process between teacher and trainer which enlists the teacher's creativity, intellect, skills and active participation. It is the trainer's responsibility to respond to the needs and interests of individual teachers and fulfill a supportive role as facilitator of curriculum implementation. The Trainer's Manual is designed to support the trainer (or curriculum assistant) in the planning and selection of training experiences that meet both the need to systematically introduce and monitor curriculum goals and principles and the need to relate training to the individual classroom needs of teachers.

Trainer's Manual

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

Training in the Cognitively Oriented Preschool Curriculum 1
Responsibilities & Skills Required of the Curriculum Assistant 3
The Training Sequence 6
Use of the Trainer's Manual 8
Classroom Follow-up 10
Use of Audiovisual Media
Media as a Tool for Training 11
Media Workshop Materials 13
Assessment and Evaluation
Pre- and Post- Workshop Assessment 14
The Preschool Teacher Training Profile 16
The Child Observation Record 17

CHILD DEVELOPMENT THEORY
Workshop I 18

ROOM ARRANGEMENT
Workshop I 48
Workshop II 74

DAILY ROUTINE
Workshop I 97
Workshop II 119
Workshop III 120

ACTIVE LEARNING
Workshop I 164
Workshop II 217
Workshop III 243

LANGUAGE
Workshop I 293
Workshop II 342

EXPERIENCING & REPRESENTING
Workshop I 365
Workshop II 413
Workshop III 436
Workshop IV 455

SPACE
Workshop I 476

TIME
Workshop I 504

GUIDE TO WORKSHOP AND CLASSROOM FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES FOR INDIVIDUAL FILMS, FILMSTRIPS AND VIDEOTAPES. . .528

Audio-visual Materials

The High/Scope-BEH Special Project produced a series of audio-visual materials that form key elements in the multi-media learning packages. These training films are described as follows:

Key Experiences for Intellectual Development During the Preschool Years
(16mm film transfer of slide/tape presentation; color, sound;19 min.)

Scenes from the High/Scope Preschool illustrate some of the major "key experiences" for the cognitive development of the preschoolage child - in active learning, language, representation, classification, seriation, number concepts, temporal relations and spacial relations.

Thinking and Reasoning in Preschool Children
(16mm film transfer of videotape; black&white, sound; 23 min.)

An overview of the characteristics of children's thinking in the "preoperational" stage of development. The film illustrates some of the important concepts and reasoning abilities that children develop during the preschool years. It shows how the child's understanding of the world affects his behavior and problem-solving methods. A concise introduction to a complex subject.

Learning About Time in the Preschool Years
(16mm film transfer of videotape; black&white,sound; 37.5 min.)

This two-part film shows how teachers can help children understand the concepts of time; it illustrates strategies for encouraging children to recall the past, anticipate the future and observe and represent temporal sequences and intervals. The first part shows how to help children observe the beginning and end of time periods, observe movement and change, and begin to represent the passage of time. The second part shows how young children learn to anticipate and recall events and observe and predict the order in which events occur.

Spatial Learning in the Preschool Years
(16mm film transfer of videotape; black&white,sound; 22 min.)

A view of the preoperational child's understanding of the way things relate to one another in three-dimensional space - the look and feel of objects, their shapes, contours and edges and the way some things fit next to or inside of one another. This film shows children gaining spatial understanding through exploration and manipulation of objects. Scenes from the High/Scope Preschool suggest ways of providing appropriate classroom materials and experiences for spacial problem solving. There are also scenes showing the development of spacial understanding in infancy.

Arranging the Classroom: Case Study of the High/Scope Preschool
(color filmstrip and cassette tape; 15 min.)

A teacher from the High/Scope Preschool describes her attempts to implement principles of room arrangement and to select and organize materials to promote intellectual development - that is, to give children opportunities to exercise emerging cognitive abilities that are critical to the formation of more mature modes of thinking. She discusses the changes in her classroom structure and equipment over the course of the year.

Integration of Handicapped and Nonhandicapped Preschool Children - Parents' Perspectives

(16mm film transfer of videotape; black&white, sound; 15 min.)

The sound portion of this film is an unrehearsed discussion among the parents of handicapped and nonhandicapped children who spent the 1974-75 school year together in the High/Scope Preschool. The parents discuss the benefits of the preschool program for their children; they mention the social and intellectual growth they have seen and discuss the aspects of the curriculum they feel have furthered this growth. They discuss some of the apprehensions they had at the beginning of the year, and how they feel at the end of the year in view of their children's experiences. They also discuss the influences they feel the children had on each other. The visual counterpoint to this dialogue is the children themselves as they work together in the preschool classroom.

Guidelines for Evaluating Activities

(16mm film transfers of videotapes; black&white, sound; 58 min. total; discussion guides included)

A set of three films, each of which demonstrates alternative ways teachers can plan and carry out activities with a group of preschool children. Each film shows two contrasting styles of structuring and leading a group activity using similar materials but different teaching methods and goals. Useful for stimulating discussion of teaching styles and educational philosophies. An accompanying observation guide offers criteria by which to evaluate and revise classroom activities. Also included is a trainer's supplement that discusses the films in terms of the criteria in the guide and offers suggestions for revising the activities.

Team Planning in the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum

(16mm film transfer of videotape; black&white; 18 min.)

This film documents the activities of two preschool teachers at various times of the school day. It shows them planning, considering ways to support both the children and each other, sharing observations of the children, and evaluating the effectiveness of the activities they had planned for the day.

Supporting Communication Among Preschoolers

(16mm film transfer of videotape; black&white, sound; 3 reels, 78 min. total)

This seven part film deals with the cognitive, social and linguistic aspects of communication and illustrates a wide variety of teaching strategies for stimulating communication among preschoolers. Parts I and II are narrated films. Parts III-VI illustrate teaching strategies and show un-narrated classroom episodes which viewers are asked to analyze; part VII is in a question-answer format with breaks for discussion.

Part I—An Important Opportunity

Examples of verbal communication in the classroom; the ways children use language and the benefits they gain from it.

Part II—Opportunities in the Classroom

How the daily routine can provide children with opportunities to

communicate with one another. How teachers can support children as givers and receivers of information.
Part III—Encouraging Interaction and Cooperation
A presentation of teaching strategies to promote interaction and cooperation among children.
Part IV—Referring One Child's Questions of Problems to Another
Often children can help each other with problems that arise in the course of their activities. In asking and answering questions and helping each other to solve problems, they use language in important and meaningful ways. This film shows what teachers can do to encourage this type of interaction.
Part V—Interpreting or"Delivering" Messages
Sometimes a teacher needs to be a "go between" for children, helping one child understand what another is trying to say, helping the other to find ways to say what he means. Often the teacher may have to "deliver" messages that weren't received or acknowledged. This film illustrates several such situations.
Part VI —Encouraging Active Listening
Ways in which teachers can help children listen to, think about and act upon each other's statements, questions or suggestions.
Part VII— Examples for Discussion

Working with Teachers and Parents: Leading Group Discussions
(videotape)

Working with Teachers and Parents: In-Service Training
(videotape; 30 min.)

Stimulus materials which show dramatizations of typical situations encountered by early childhood curriculum specialists. Viewers are asked to analyze the interactions and suggest strategies to deal with or alter the situations. These are targeted for individuals in leadership and training roles in early childhood programs.

Active Learning Supplement: Classroom Examples for Discussion
(videotape)

Language Supplement: Classroom Examples for Discussion
(videotape)

Experiencing and Representing Supplement: Classroom Examples for Discussion
(videotape)

The above materials consist of unnarrated episodes of teacher-child or child-child interactions. They are to be used as discussion starters or as assessement devices, testing problem solving or observational skills.

Learning About Time in the Preschool Years: Classroom Examples for Discussion
(videotape; 18 min.)

Unnarrated episodes of classroom interactions which are designed to provoke discussion or assess problem solving or observational skills.

Feelings in the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum
(Videotape; 47.10 minutes total)

Scenes from the High/Scope preschool classroom are used to demonstrate how the elements of the cognitive curriculum contribute to a child's positive self esteem. These four sections of videotape clips are intended to be used separately in workshop settings which deal with the topics listed below.

Section I - Giving Positive Feedback (12 minutes)
Demonstrates a number of ways children in the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum receive reinforcement in the classroom, both from teachers and their peers.

Section II - Recognizing Children's Feelings (7 minutes)
Illustrates how teachers help children to express and deal with emotions and how a child's cognitive capacities affect the way he/she is able to understand his/her own and other peoples' feelings.

Section III - Interactions Between Handicapped and Nonhandicapped Children (6 minutes)
Documents examples of child/child interactions when handicapped preschoolers are integrated into the regular classroom and introduces strategies to help teachers deal with comments, feelings, attitudes, and actions which occur when mainstreaming is implemented.

Section IV - Resolving Conflicts (17 minutes)
Illustrates classroom examples to be used in a workshop which discusses how the cognitive curriculum framework helps minimize conflicts among children, and which introduces strategies for teachers to help children find alternatives to aggressive behavior in their attempts to resolve conflicts.

Guidelines for Observing Children with Special Needs
(Videotape; black & white, sound; 80 min. total; discussion guides)

A set of 4 videotapes each of which depict a child in a classroom setting. Each child has been identified as having a handicap of some nature in one of the following areas: speech and language; multiply handicapped; physically handicapped; and developmentally delayed. The videotapes are useful for observing children from a developmental viewpoint and discussing appropriate teaching strategies. Each tape has a discussion guide; background information, and an observation guide.

Tape I - Peter: A Case Study (15 minutes)
Tape II - John: A Case Study (22 minutes)
Tape III - Mark: A Case Study (16 minutes)
Tape IV - Mike: A Case Study (27 minutes)

Small Group Time: An Illustrated Checklist

(videotape, black & white, sound; 11:35 min.)

Intended as a springboard for discussion in teacher training workshops, this program presents some examples of preschool teachers conducting small group activities, and asks a set of questions for teachers to use in planning and evaluating small group activities with young children.

FIELD SITE TRAINING

The High/Scope-BEH Special Project for the Preparation of Preschool Specialists provided inservice training to over 400 teachers and other educational personnel in five states: Michigan, New Jersey, Virginia, Maryland, and Ohio. Twenty curriculum assistants were trained as trainers for the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum at the field replication sites, which were located in more than fifty school districts. The services provided, the sites, and the key individuals involved are summarized on the pages that follow.

Field sites provided High/Scope with formative feedback on the training model being developed as the curriculum model was refined and specific training materials were produced. Chapter 6 describes some of the systematic evaluation procedures which were used, but much was also learned from the direct, on-site contact by High/Scope consultants. Because regular consulting visits were made, the project could get feedback from the teachers who were being trained, from local curriculum assistants, and directly through classroom observation and observation of local training sessions.

New Jersey: A Statewide Replication System

In New Jersey High/Scope had the extraordinary opportunity to cooperate with the New Jersey Department of Education in setting up a statewide dissemination network for the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum as an option available in New Jersey for preschool special education. This statewide network grew out of conversations in 1974 between Daniel Ringelheim, then New Jersey's Director of Special Education, and David Weikart, president of High/Scope Foundation. Following up on these conversations, Ms. Vincentz Cianci, New Jersey Coordinator for Early Childhood Special Education, visited High/Scope's annual conference and High/Scope staff gave an orientation conference in Trenton for representatives of school districts across New Jersey. During 1975-1976 teachers in pilot classrooms in Ewing Township, Ventnor, Piscataway, and Montclair received training from High/Scope consultants. These classes and teachers were to become dissemination nodes for training and demonstration activities in the following year. Curriculum specialists in addition to classroom teachers were involved in the training the first year and also in the second when the parent coordinators received training in the High/Scope approach.

By combining resources of the Special Project and state funds, the training system continued to grow in New Jersey during 1976-1977, when many more school districts and teachers, as shown by the charts on page 56 , opted to participate in the workshop series and consulting visits provided by High/Scope. The New Jersey Department of Education arranged for six graduate credits to be granted through William Paterson State College for teachers attending the workshops. These credits could be applied toward an endorsement on a teaching certificate, giving teachers dual certification in early childhood and special educa-

tion. Seventy professionals were enrolled in the workshop series for credit. As large number of people became involved in the New Jersey training process, High/Scope consultants focused increasingly on workshops and training of trainers rather than on direct classroom consultation, although it was useful to monitor the progress of selected classes in order to get feedback concerning classroom implementation. High/Scope media were purchased for centralized access in four New Jersey regions, insuring that dissemination specialists would be able to locate High/Scope training materials efficiently through the Education Improvement Centers and other resource centers.

New Jersey represents one of the most ambitious dissemination efforts High/Scope has undertaken at the preschool level of curriculum implementation. Through the committed leadership of Vin Cianci and Paul Porado, following through on suggestions from Daniel Ringelheim, there are now growing numbers of classrooms using the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum in preschool special education classes in New Jersey and there is a network of support services available to teachers who want to implement the model. At a year-end meeting on May 5, 1977 teachers from throughout the state met to review and exchange their experiences using the High/Scope model. Interest and enthusiasm shown were remarkable. The New Jersey dissemination process will continue in 1977-1978, adding new teachers to the workshop series.

The size and scope of the New Jersey dissemination system are unique among the Special Project field sites, but each of the other field sites contributed importantly to High/Scope's experience in helping teachers use the Cognitively Oriented Preschool Curriculum with handicapped youngsters.

The New Jersey sites were primarily working with non-integrated groups of handicapped children, although pilot classrooms integrating handicapped and non-handicapped preschoolers have been started in Montclair. The focus on handicapped children rather than integrated groupings occurred at other sites as well, because of availability of funds through special education channels and absence of universal public preschool education. In some centers we were working with preschool programs designed to serve a wide range of preschool children, not exclusively those considered to be handicapped. Explicitly integrating handicapped and non-handicapped children were some of the daycare and Head Start centers in the Athens, Ohio area; the Capitol Area Head Start program in Lansing, Michigan; the Ann Arbor, Michigan Public Schools; and the Resurrection Preschool in Alexandria, Virginia.

Classes implementing the model served children with most of the kinds of handicaps that school programs may be expected to reach, and served children with handicaps ranging from mild to severe.

Athens, Ohio preschool programs

Ohio University Normalization Project director Lloyd Inglis invited High/Scope to assist Athens area Head Start and day care centers with classroom curriculum implementation for integrated groups of children (handicapped and non-handicapped). High/Scope consultants are working with two agencies (Tri-County Community Action Agency and Jackson-Vinton Head Start) as well as a campus child care center at Ohio University (Ohio University Nursery Child Care Center). These Athens area programs also receive technical assistance from the Ohio University Normalization Project. Handicapped children include: language impaired, cerebral palsy, deaf, physically handicapped, health impaired, Down's syndrome, educable mentally impaired.

Ann Arbor, Michigan Public Schools

Special Education consultant Janice Frieder received training in the High/Scope approach during 1974-75. The Ann Arbor Schools have integrated handicapped and non-handicapped children by combining Head Start Title I and a number of the key early childhood staff (Title I director, curriculum coordinator, evaluators, teachers) had been involved in the evolution of the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum since 1962.

Alexandria, Virginia: Resurrection Preschool

This center is a First Chance Project which uses the High/Scope model as the basis for a classroom curriculum in a private preschool serving an integrated group of children. The Resurrection Preschool is an important resource for early childhood special education programs seeking technical assistance in the Washington, D. C. area.

Handicapped children served by the Resurrection Preschool include children in the following categories: Down's Syndrome, language impaired, failure to thrive, motor delay.

Baltimore, Maryland: Gateway Preschool

This is a public school facility serving "communication disordered" children, including language impaired, language delayed, and hearing impaired youngsters. Gateway provides High/Scope classrooms as one treatment mode, as well as classrooms employing more traditional speech therapy approaches. The center has served as a dissemination mode for the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum for other Baltimore public school early childhood classes.

Belleville, Michigan: Van Buren Schools

The Van Buren Schools elementary-level teacher for the educable mentally impaired attended the 1974-75 workshop session in Ypsilanti in anticipation of opening up a preschool handicapped program the following year. This preschool program did not materialize during 1975-76.

Inkster, Michigan: Westwood Schools

Westwood, a school district in a Detroit suburb not far from Ypsilanti, had been using the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum in compensatory education classes before the Special Project. The Westwood schools wanted to extend use of the High/Scope approach to its early childhood special education classes. The school district serves primarily Black youngsters, often diagnosed by the school system as having speech and language handicaps. Speech Therapists on staff have participated in High/Scope training as well as the classroom teachers.

Marquette, Michigan: Marquette-Alger Intermediate School District

The Preschool Developmental Program located at St. Michael's School in Marquette and the Munising Preschool Developmental Program in Munising have children who are mostly still in the sensorimotor period of development, i.e. they exhibit toddler and infant-like behavior, and are considered moderately or severely mentally impaired. They include blind, emotionally disturbed, Down's Syndrome, cerebral palsy, cleft palate and brain damaged children. Four other classrooms dispersed throughout the Marquette area (located in Michigan's Upper Peninsula) received High/Scope training, but did not continue to receive training in 1976-77.

The Marquette programs challenged our consultants to develop curriculum expertise in the sensorimotor levels of development. Teachers in Marquette and Munising made important contributions to High/Scope thinking in this regard.

Port Huron and Marysville, Michigan: St. Clair County Intermediate School District

Sandy Gordan, instructional coordinator of the St. Clair County ISD preschool handicapped program, had followed the development of the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum since the '60's and enthusiastically responded to the possibility of working closely with High/Scope as one of the Special Project field sites, back in 1974.

Since then the St. Clair County program has closely cooperated with High/Scope. High/Scope consultants have worked with the classes for the severely mentally impaired at Woodland Developmental Center, the district's new facility, as well as with the preschool program which serves the mildly and moderately involved children: emotionally impaired, mentally impaired, language impaired, and physically impaired.

Ypsilanti, Michigan Public Schools

During 1974-75, teachers in Ypsilanti's "developmental kindergarten" received training in the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum. This was followed up in 1975-76 with additional on-site visits.

HIGH/SCOPE FOUNDATION CONSULTING SERVICES TO PROGRAMS SERVING HANDICAPPED CHILDREN 1974-1977

Center	Location	Year	Staff	D T
Resurrection Preschool	Alexandria, Virginia	1975-76	10	
Resurrection Preschool	Alexandria, Virginia	1976-77	8	
Ann Arbor Public Schools	Ann Arbor, Michigan	1974-75	1	
Athens Area Preschools Jackson-Vinton Head Start Tri-County Action Agency (day care) Ohio University Child Care Center Ohio University Normalization Programming For Young Children Project	Athens, Ohio	1975-76 1976-77	19 30	
Baltimore Public Schools Gateway Preschool	Baltimore, Maryland	1976-77	29	
Highland Park School District (D)	Highland Park, Michigan	1976-77		
Hillsdale Intermediate School District (D)	Hillsdale County, Michigan	1976-77	5	
Westwood Schools Westwood Child Development Center	Inkster, Michigan	1974-75 1975-76 1976-77	3 10 7	
Capitol Area Head Start (D)	Lansing, Michigan	1976-77	30	
Marquette-Alger Intermediate School District	Marquette, Michigan	1975-76 1976-77	12 4	
New Jersey: North Montclair, Teaneck, River Vale, North Vale, Ringwood, River Edge, Jersey City, Hepatcung, Leonia, Springfield, Bayonne, Winfield Park, Cedar Knolls, Sussex, Newark, Paterson, Piscataway, Millborn, Montville, Flanders, Phillipsburg, Rockaway, Morris Plains, Bernards Township, Wharton, Washington Township	Montclair, Piscataway	1975-76 1976-77	12 94	
New Jersey: South Ventnor, Ewing, Manahawkin, Pitman, Corbin City, Milmay, Colts Neck, Matawan		1975-76 1976-77	16 50	
St. Clair County Intermediate School District	Marysville, Michigan	1974-75 1975-76 1976-77	1 15 9	
Van Buren Public Schools	Belleville, Michigan	1974-75	1	
Van Dyke Public Schools (D)	Warren, Michigan	1976-77	18	
Washtenaw County Intermediate School District (D)	Washtenaw County, Michigan	1976-77	15	
Ypsilanti Public Schools	Ypsilanti, Michigan	1974-75	1	

D = BEH Demonstration Project Field site.
Others are Special Project Field Sites.

taff	On-Site Days in Training	High/Scope Consultant	Handi-capped Children		Local Trainers	Local Directors
10	2	Carole Thomson	6	Mixed	Laura Huff	Minnie Anderson
8	10	Joanna Phinney	6			
1	0				Janice Frieder	
19	12	Susan Shipstead	29	Mixed	Arlene Sheak Jane Beecher	Loyd Inglis
30	14	Sharon Bixby	95		Kay Woyar Marion McNairy Liz Ohle	
29	10	Joanna Phinney	3	Comm. Disor.	Anita Davidsen	
	12 *	Bettye McDonald				
5	12 *	Sally Adler	82	Mixed		Clara Packard
3	3	Mary Hohmann	19	Mixed		Margaret Trombly
10	10	Mary Hohmann	91			
7	10	Bettye McDonald	100			
20	12 *		22	Mixed		
12	15	Joanna Phinney	64	TMI	Rose Mary Lenti	
4	15	Joanna Phinney	21			
12	40	Joanna Phinney	23	Mixed	Mani Mammett	Vin Cianci, State Dept. of Ed
94	40	Sally Adler	300	Mixed	Margo Cafiero Paquita Roberts	Education
18	40	Susan Shipstead	73	Mixed		
30	40	Linda Rogers	160	Mixed	Grace Guido Richard Titus	
1	3	Mary Hohmann	8	Mixed	Sandy Gordan	
15	32	Carole Thomson	78	EMI,TMI,SMI		
9	15	Joanna Phinney	39	Mixed	Sandy Gordan	
1	2	Carole Thomson Mary Hohmann	12	EMI		Bob Crain
18	12 *	Jean Ispa	23	Mixed		
15	12 *	Sally Adler	64	Hearing Impaired	Peggy Marquis	
1	3	Carole Thomson	25	Developmentally Delayed		Pat Dignan

*no. of workshops presented

Field Service Model

The original Special Project proposal had spelled out a field replication process based on training classroom teachers in the classroom competencies associated with the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum, and then moving these teachers into training roles as curriculum specialists or staff development coordinators. Previous experience has indicated the importance of credibility of the local trainer as a teacher who had implemented the model in a classroom situation, not just as an "expert at the verbal level."

The sequence of training someone as a classroom teacher in the use of the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum, and then training that person to become a dissemination specialist in the model was not always feasible. Sometimes there were already curriculum staff in leadership roles who could be trained to become dissemination specialists in the High/Scope model. Sometimes finances did not permit using a training specialist at all. We worked directly with teachers in those cases where the local program was not expanding or the size of the program or level of funding did not permit the sort of training and supervision model that has been effective elsewhere. Often, too, classroom teachers prefer working with children and do not wish to become teacher trainers. Sometimes the need for trainers to travel, locally and to Ypsilanti for workshops, etc., made it difficult for individual teachers to assume a dissemination role.

In other words, it was necessary to broaden our training model to include a variety of alternative training and dissemination procedures and vehicles. We could not always plan for a cycle in which a classroom teacher gained experience with the model and then became a trainer.

Materials and services provided to field sites included:

For Field-based Teachers:

- Teacher's manual and supplementary readings
- On-site workshops by High/Scope consultants and local CA based on multi-media learning packages.
- Classroom observation by local CA and High/Scope consultant
- Visits to High/Scope demonstration classroom in Ypsilanti or at local site
- Demonstration teaching by High/Scope consultant or local CA.

For Field-based Trainers

- Trainer's manual
- Observation and feedback from High/Scope consultant on workshop skills and skills relating to observation of teaching/learning interactions.
- Training at High/Scope headquarters in one-week trainer's institutes.
- Consultation by High/Scope consultant on training goals and methods: on site and via phone and mail.

High/Scope consultants were teachers with experience implementing the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum in the classroom. All had been trained by High/Scope in using the Curriculum and participated in the development of the training materials as another major part of their jobs, complementing their on-site experience as trainers in the remote or field sites.

Consultants developed training plans for a particular site visit with the teachers or curriculum assistants at the local site. These plans were reviewed by the project director or field services coordinator (Carole Thomson 1973-76) at High/Scope. Field visit reports contained observations and recommendations for further training activities.

History and Summary of Special Project Field Service Provision

During 1974-75 the Special Project provided training to curriculum assistants from five Michigan school districts. Training was provided through a workshop series at High/Scope in Ypsilanti, observation at the High/Scope preschool, and visits to the field centers by High/Scope consultants. Thirteen workshops were held at the Foundation's headquarters for these individuals, assembled as a group. These Michigan sites had responded to letters sent to area school districts soliciting interest in High/Scope training, and to a presentation made by project staff at a conference in Lansing. Van Buren and Ann Arbor were in the process of developing plans for serving special education preschoolers and had not yet begun to do so. Ypsilanti was operating a "developmental kindergarten" and the teacher in this program participated in the training. Ypsilanti experienced difficulties covering the class for release time for teacher training. Van Buren, Ann Arbor, and Ypsilanti did not have classrooms available for preschool training in 1975-76 and dropped out of further training activities.

During 1975-76 training services expanded to nine field sites, counting four in New Jersey (two in the north and two in the south). In addition to New Jersey, the new field sites were Resurrection Preschool in Alexandria, Virginia (a First Chance project), Marquette-Alger Intermediate School District in Michigan's Upper Peninsula, and a group of preschool programs cooperating with Ohio University's Normalization Programming for Young Children Project.

In 1976-77 the Gateway Preschool in Baltimore was added to the list of centers receiving training to the Special Project, along with five centers receiving High/Scope training in Michigan through the companion First Chance project.

Training Materials

Much of what we learned in the process of implementing field training during 1974-77 has been incorporated in the materials developed by the Special Project. The Trainer's Manual specifically documents the process and sequence of training that was found to be effective. Additional audio-visual products of the project that most directly capture the training process and can be used in training trainers are:

Team planning in the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum (videotape/film)

Working with Teachers and Parents: Leading Group Discussions (videotape)

Working with Teachers and Parents: In-service Training (videotape)

A supplement to the trainer's manual was prepared during 1976-77 dealing with "strategies for trainers." This document will be incorporated into a revised trainer's manual being prepared during 1977-78.

EVALUATION OF TRAINING

- Robert D. Matz and Jean Ispa

The High/Scope BEH Special Project required formative feedback on its training in order to improve the training model and materials as they were being developed. The project also aimed to develop evaluation instruments that would be of value in succeeding replication waves of the training model.

The instruments described in this chapter were used in evaluating the Project's training effectiveness from several perspectives:

- Trainee's classroom teaching as observed by trainers. (The Preschool Teacher Training Profile,p. 62)
- Trainee's answers to questions designed to measure intellectual mastery of the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum. (Written assessments, p. 79)
- Trainee's feedback concerning their perceptions of the training (Inservice Training Evaluation questionnaire,p. 89)
- Trainee's value systems as related to early childhood education. (Values Q Sort, p. 97)

The Preschool Teacher Training Profile

The High/Scope Preschool Teacher Training Profile (PTTP) is included on pages 68-78 in this report. First developed in 1975, the PTTP contains descriptions of desirable teacher behaviors within our curriculum areas. Each objective is defined at length in related curriculum materials. The PTTP is intended to provide a formal record of the extent to which the curriculum is implemented and to help define training needs for individual teachers.

Because the PTTP items refer to specific classroom behaviors and are aligned with other training materials, use of the PTTP helps trainees (teachers and aids) and consultants focus upon curriculum areas. A common process in training is for the trainee to complete a section of the PTTP on herself and for the High/Scope consultant or local curriculum assistant to complete the same section (based on observing the teacher). Then, the two discuss their perception. This process has been found beneficial in clarifying training needs. The qualifications of attainment ratings associated with each objective facilitate individualization of the training program by reflecting the trainee's commitment to curriculum goals and environmental factors that may impede implementation (e.g. a

teacher may not be able to implement some room arrangement objectives because she teaches in the morning and a kindergarten uses the same room in the afternoon.)

When used before and after training, the PTTP results describe the extent of implementation attributable to the program. Used in this way for research purposes it can reveal differential progress across sites and classrooms. When used after training and not before, PTTP results describe very specifically, the final level of implementation.

Results

The PTTP shows the percentage of cases within each category for the attainment ratings and qualifications for each objective from PTTP's competed in May, 1976 at eight of our field centers. These data were collected by High/Scope curriculum consultants. Summing over all of the PTTP items, the modal qualification was "No Training in Competency Yet." The second most frequently checked qualification was "More or Different Training/Experience Needed."

Tables 1 and 2 show the mean attainment ratings across sites for May, 1976 and May, 1977, respectively. During 1977, the evaluation plan was to have the end-of-year PTTP's completed by curriculum assistants (CA's) attached to the local sites because the CA's have the opportunity to spend more time observing in each classroom. The reduction of the number of sites for which end-of-year data were obtained from 1976 to 1977 reflects the fact that some CA's did not spend the needed time observing classrooms during the spring of 1977. Despite this problem, the actual number of trainees for whom profiles were obtained was greater in 1977.

In general, the results for both years modulated between each objective being completely and substantially obtained. As shown by the breadth of the standard deviations, some individual trainees did not reach this level; but the overall indication is successful implementation of the curriculum.

Table 1
End-of-Year Preschool Teacher Training
Profile Results for 1976[a]

	No. of sites	No. of Trainees	Mean Attainment Rating	Standard Deviation
Room Arrangement	8	41	3.20	0.67
Daily Routine	8	39	2.58	0.87
Action	8	36	3.18	0.57
Language	8	36	1.83	1.02
Representation	7	24	1.94	0.92
Classification	7	23	1.81	1.27
Seriation	7	22	1.66	1.16
Number	7	23	2.03	1.15
Space	7	24	1.60	0.85
Time	7	23	1.87	1.05
Feelings	7	23	2.16	1.47
Classroom Management	7	24	2.61	0.79
Team Evaluation and Planning	7	24	1.74	1.07
Working with Parents	3	7	2.90	1.00

[a]The quantification of attainment ratings was as follows: Not Observed = missing data; No Indication = 0; Some indication = 1; Substantial Indication = 2; Objective Attained = 4.

Table 2
End-of-Year Preschool Teacher Training
Profile Results for 1977[a]

	No. of sites	No. of trainees	Mean Attainment Rating	Standard Deviation
Room Arrangement	5	54	3.07	0.82
Daily Routine	5	54	2.73	1.00
Action	5	53	2.87	0.86
Language	5	53	2.42	0.94
Representation	5	53	2.28	1.27
Classification	3	30	1.94	1.08
Seriation	3	30	2.01	1.40
Number	3	30	1.93	1.15
Space	3	30	2.16	1.16
Time	5	53	2.17	1.67
Feelings	5	53	2.13	1.27
Classroom Management	5	53	2.47	0.91
Team Evaluation and Planning	5	53	1.98	1.13
Working with Parents	4	31	2.40	1.40

[a]The quantification of attainment ratings was as follows: Not Observed = missing data; No Indication = 0; Some Indication = 1; Substantial Indication = 2; Objective Attained = 4.

PTTP Reliability

During the spring of 1977, an effort was made to determine the inter-rater reliability of the PTTP. For this purpose, three pairs of High/Scope consultants observed in the High/Scope First Chance Preschool in Ypsilanti and a fourth pair observed in the High/Scope - McKinstry Head Start Center in Detroit. It was decided that consultants would fill out a PTTP after observing a teacher for three days. Each pair of consultants observing in Ypsilanti observed for two 3-day periods and filled out two separate PTTPs for each period. The consultant pair observing in Detroit observed for only one 3-day period. There were thus seven pairs of PTTPs completed for the purpose of determining reliability.

For each 3-day period, the two members of each pair chose between themselves which teacher and on which three days to observe. Their only other instructions were to observe and then to independently rate teachers on implementation just as they would in the field. The "Qualifications" section of the form was to be ignored. The instructions were purposely kept loose because our goal was to determine how reliable the PTTP is when used as it actually has been for the past two years. For this reason also, the 1975 version of the instrument was used.

In order to compute reliability, the five ratings possible for each PTTP item were assigned points as follows: (0) not observed; (1) no indication; (2) some indication; (3) substantial indication; and (4) objective attained. Next, for each item and for each consultant pair, the difference between the two ratings was determined. Complete agreement thus obtained a "0"; the least agreement possible obtained a "3." Items to which one of the consultants had responded with a "0" were not counted for mean level of disagreement.

Across consultants, the mean level of disagreement per item was obtained by averaging the seven "disagreement points." For each section of the PTTP (i.e. "Room Arrangement," "Daily Routine," etc.) the mean level of disagreement across all items was obtained.

In order to provide a second indicator of reliability, the number of consultant pairs who disagreed (i.e. got a score of 1,2, or 3) was also calculated. All of these estimates of reliability, the mean disagreement per item, the mean disagreement per section, and the number of consultant pairs disagreeing on each item are detailed in Table 1.

Results on mean level of disagreement indicated that for almost every item, disagreements between consultants were by less than one rating point. The section most agreed upon was Room Arrangement, probably because the physical layout of a classroom tends to be easily observed and does not change from minute to minute.

The sections on Language, Representation, Classification, Seriation, Number, Space, and Feelings were rated least reliably. These are all areas which require a great deal of conceptual understanding and perceptiveness on the part of the observer. Also, both observers must be actively attending to the teacher at exactly the same moment because a single comment heard by one but missed by another can throw the ratings off.

In thinking about these results, it is important to realize that even the inter-rater differences on the more conceptual sections were small. No section showed average disagreements by as much as one point. The PTTP, therefore, should certainly be continued to be viewed as a useful tool for teacher assessment, particularly for purposes of self-evaluation and for constructive feedback by consultants to teachers. Revisions of the instrument will take the reliability figures into account so that those items hardest to agree upon receive the greatest attention.

HIGH/SCOPE EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH FOUNDATION

copyright © 1975

Teacher_____

Trainer_____

Date_____

PRESCHOOL TEACHER TRAINING PROFILE

DIRECTIONS

This form should be used in part or in entirety as soon after each actual observation session as possible. Before using this form, it is necessary for the evaluator to be aware of the type of training the teacher has had. For each item, if the attainment rating is other than "Objective Attained," a relevant qualification needs to be checked. The category, "Not Observed" means that there was not an appropriated situation for the objective to occur. On the other hand, "No Indication" means that there was an appropriate situation for the objective to occur, but the teacher did not implement the objective.

In order for a particular objective to be considered attained, it is necessary for the behavior of the objective to occur in an appropriate context. For instance, it would probably be inappropriate for the teacher to ask children to recall an event that had occurred working with fingerpaint while the children are engaged in sociodramatic play on the theme of dining at a restaurant. The rating of "Substantial Indication"means that the behavior of the objective does not always occur when called for but does occur at least 50% of the times when relevant. "Some Indication" means that the teacher behavior occurs in less than 50% of the occasions when it is appropriate. The qualification, "Context Impedes Implementation" refers to a situation in which there are some constraints that do not allow implementation of the objective and for which the teacher is not responsible.

Teacher_____

Trainer_____

Date_____

OBJECTIVES	ATTAINMENT RATING					QUALIFICATIONS			
	Not Observed	No Indication	Some Indication	Substantial Indication	Objective Attained	No Training in Competency Yet	More or Different Training/Experience Needed	Context Impedes Implementation	Teacher Does Not Want to Implement
				% of Cases					
Room Arrangement									
1. Divides room into several distinct areas			19	10	71		64	27	9
2. Boundaries of areas are well defined		2	19	40	40		76	16	8
3. Each area has an adequate amount of space		4	13	31	52		43	48	10
4. Work areas are not cluttered with unnecessary furniture or materials			21	27	52		53	24	24
5. Areas are designed to facilitate traffic flow and minimize noise			8	33	58		50	42	8
6. Materials are stored in areas where they are used			6	13	81		67	33	
7. Materials are classified and labeled clearly		2	25	38	35		91		9
8. Materials are at children's eye level and within reach			4	4	92		100		
9. Individual storage space is provided for each child's belongings		26			74		33	11	56
10. All materials within the children's sight and reach can be used			4	21	75		18	46	36
11. Display space is present and used for children's work in each area		2	21	35	42		67	29	5
12. There are unstructured materials in each area that can be used in many ways			19	29	52		90	11	
13. There are enough materials in each area for children to work simultaneously			8	35	56		81	13	6
14. Familiarizes children with names and contents of areas	8	2	21	17	52		100		
15. Changes or adds new equipment and materials throughout the year	34	9	6	2	49		80		20

Teacher_____

Trainer_____

Date_____

	ATTAINMENT RATING					QUALIFICATIONS			
	Not Observed	No Indication	Some Indication	Substantial Indication	Objective Attained	No Training in Competency Yet	More or Different Training/Experience Needed	Context Impedes Implementation	Teacher Does Not Want to Implement
Daily Routine				% of Cases					
1. Routine includes: planning, work, cleanup, recall, small group, activity and circle times		4	7	28	61		77	15	8
2. Each time period has a definite name which children are helped to learn	11	9	13	33	35		96		5
3. Routine is consistent from day to day	4	2	4	24	64		83	17	
4. Helps children make transitions from one part of routine to another	7	4	29	26	35		100		
5. Provides for some novelty in the routine	35		15	13	37		100		
6. When familiar routine is changed, advises children ahead of time	59	9	9	2	21		100		
(PLANNING TIME)									
7. Helps children to plan what they are going to do	2	7	7	26	59		94		6
8. Helps children to know and use symbols and planning boards, (That is, does the planning experience occur?)	7	9	4	15	65		90		10
9. Allows children to communicate plans in a variety of ways	4	20	30	26	20		97	3	
10. Helps children to make increasingly complete, complex plans	11	26	30	22	11		97	3	
(WORK TIME)									
11. The children are allowed at least 40 minutes to work on their plans each day		7			94		100		
12. Helps children get started on plan when necessary		7	23	25	46		100		
13. Helps children to carry out plans and make new ones when finished		12	37	16	35		100		
14. Helps children extend their plans	2	16	38	18	25		100		
15. Provides opportunities and encourages children to work together	2	7	35	33	24		100		

Teacher_____

Trainer_____

Date_____

	ATTAINMENT RATING					QUALIFICATIONS			
	Not Observed	No Indication	Some Indication	Substantial Indication	Objective Attained	No Training in Competency Yet	More or Different Training/Experience Needed	Context Impedes Implementation	Teacher Does Not Want to Implement
(CLEAN UP TIME)									
16. Encourages and helps children do most of the work			13	13	74		100		
17. Uses appropriate strategies to encourage cleanup: songs, games, etc.	4	37	22	20	17		97		3
18. Works with groups of children to foster group cleanup	20	26	17	11	26	8	92		
19. Uses cleanup time to implement cognitive, language and action goals	15	26	33	15	11		97		3
(RECALL)									
20. Encourages children to show and talk about things they have done	9	15	7	26	44		95	5	
(SMALL GROUP TIME)									
21. Activities planned by teacher allow each child to work at own level and make own choices	4	13	30	22	30		88	4	8
(ACTIVITY TIME)									
22. Children are involved in vigorous outdoor or indoor play	8	13	7	2	70		32	3	25
23. Uses activity time to implement cognitive, language, and action goals	16	33	20	11	20		80	10	10
(CIRCLE TIME)									
24. Activities allow each child to get involved in some way and have input	15	4	13	26	41		84		16
25. Provides positive options for children who do not want to participate	47	14	9	9	21		71		29
Action				% of Cases					
1. Children are actively involved at work time			7	2	91		100		
2. Children are actively invloved at cleanup time			7	10	83		100		

Teacher_____

Trainer_____

Date_____

	ATTAINMENT RATING					QUALIFICATIONS			
	Not Observed	No Indication	Some Indication	Substantial Indication	Objective Attained	No Training in Competency Yet	More or Different Training/Experience Needed	Context Impedes Implementation	Teacher Does Not Want to Implement
3. Children are actively involved at small group time			23	25	53		94		6
4. Children are actively involved at activity time	12	5	7	2	73		33	67	
5. Children are actively involved at circle time	5		10	34	51		100		
6. Children are actively involved on field trips	68	7			24			100	
7. Provides materials in each area that children can manipulate, combine and transform			7	2	91		50	50	
8. Provides materials-equipment in at least one area on which children can exercise muscles			7	10	83		25	75	
9. Provides materials that can be used in alternative ways to do the same thing		2	29	19	50		73	20	7
10. Provides diverse materials which children can touch, smell, taste and listen to			26	29	45		94	6	
11. Children do things for themselves when possible (e.g., cleanup, juice time, toilet time)			12	21	67		100		
12. Systematically helps children become self-sufficient in tool use and routine procedures	7	5	15	32	42		100		
13. Helps children extend actions by introducing new materials, questioning, suggesting		15	32	27	27		100		
14. Acknowledges and supports children's appropriate actions and choices			26	31	43		100		
15. Children are provided with choices throughout the Daily Routine	2	7	19	38	33		96		4
16. Actively engaged with children on their physical level throughout the day		2	19	21	57		75		25

Teacher_____

Trainer_____

Date_____

Language	ATTAINMENT RATING: Not Observed	No Indication	Some Indication	Substantial Indication	Objective Attained	QUALIFICATIONS: No Training in Competency Yet	More or Different Training/Experience Needed	Context Impedes Implementation	Teacher Does Not Want to Implement
	% of Cases								
1. Provides equipment which encourages the use of language			7	14	79		83	17	
2. Provides materials which encourage listening to language			24	12	64		92	8	
3. Talks with children at their eye level in conversational manner		2	15	20			92	8	
4. There is a balance between teacher and child talk throughout the routine	2	12	19	29	38		90	11	
5. Listens to what children say and makes appropriate responses	5		29	10	57		100		
6. Refers children's questions and comments to other children when possible	23	30	25	8	15		100		
7. Conversations with children throughout day relate directly to what they are doing	2		24	17	57		100		
8. Encourages children to verbalize choices, predictions, observations and helps extend their verbalizations	2	20	24	24	29	3	97		
9. Encourages children to verbally describe feelings, actions, etc. and helps extend their verbalizations	2	14	24	31	29		100		
10. Describes things or actions for the child who cannot yet describe them himself			7	15	78		100		
11. In questioning children, begins with open-ended questions			21	14	64		92		8
12. If children cannot respond to open-ended questions, asks more directed questions	12	5	29	21	33		95		5
13. Encourages children who primarily communicate nonverbally to talk	10	7	38	19	26		96	4	
14. Accepts child's manner of speaking but models adult language of community	29	19	24	12	17	13	80	7	

Teacher_____

Trainer_____

Date_____

	ATTAINMENT RATING					QUALIFICATIONS			
	Not Observed	No Indication	Some Indication	Substantial Indication	Objective Attained	No Training in Competency Yet	More or Different Training/Experience Needed	Context Impedes Implementation	Teacher Does Not Want to Implement
15. Models desirable language habits: eye-contact, listening, not shouting, etc.			21	14	64		92		8
16. When management statements are made, reasons are provided	12	5	29	21	33		95		5
17. Helps the child verbally recall what he has done whenever possible	10	7	38	19	26		96	4	
18. Writes down and reads back children's comments, observations stories, songs, etc.	29	19	24	12	17	13	80	7	
19. Provides a wide variety of books which are age appropriate and always accessible	5		36	21	38	20	75	5	
20. Helps children with basic reading and writing skills if (and only if) they request	64	5	3	5	23	36	64		
21. Provides opportunities to have fun with language	49	22	12	5	12	17	83		
Representation				% of Cases					
1. Provides children with real experiences and real things to explore and use			20	36	44	30	70		
2. Provides real experiences related to ongoing representational activity in order to enrich representation	13	22	26	26	13	16	84		
3. Provides material and opportunities to represent in diverse media			44	20	36	20	80		
4. Children are allowed to choose what and how they represent			29	29	42	21	71		7
5. Assists children in recalling and symbolically representing what they have experienced	12	12	32	36	8	15	85		
6. Helps children to represent their plans	4	32	36	8	20	20	73		7
7. Helps children extend their ongoing activity through representation	4	25	42	29		13	88		
8. Helps children represent the same thing in different media	25	33	25	13	4	15	75	10	

Teacher_____

Trainer_____

Date_____

	ATTAINMENT RATING					QUALIFICATIONS			
	Not Observed	No Indication	Some Indication	Substantial Indication	Objective Attained	No Training in Competency Yet	More or Different Training/Experience Needed	Context Impedes Implementation	Teacher Does Not Want to Implement
9. Provides opportunities to interpret symbolic representations	8	8	20	48	16	16	84		
10. Encourages and supports dramatic play	8		40	20	32	13	81		6
Classification				%	of	Cases			
1. Provides equipment and materials that can be classified or grouped in many ways				25	75	60	40		
2. Helps children investigate the attributes of things and label them		26	30	13	30	31	69		
3. Helps children describe how things are the same and different	14	32	36	14	5	32	68		
4. Helps children describe things in many ways	14	52	19	5	10	33	67		
5. Helps children use "not" statements	33	48	19			40	60		
6. Helps children hold more than one attribute in mind at a time	24	57	10	10		35	65		
7. Helps children use the concept "none" and "all"	43	57				46	54		
Seriation				%	of	Cases			
1. Provides many materials which can be seriated			39	9	52	50	50		
2. Helps children make comparisions of two things along the same dimension	4	39	30	22	4	29	71		
3. Helps children arrange several things in order along one dimension	17	44	22	17		30	70		

Teacher_____

Trainer_____

Date_____

	ATTAINMENT RATING					QUALIFICATIONS			
	Not Observed	No Indication	Some Indication	Substantial Indication	Objective Attained	No Training in Competency Yet	More or Different Training/Experience Needed	Context Impedes Implementation	Teacher Does Not Want to Implement
Number				%	of Cases				
1. Helps children compare number and amount	30	15	30	25		33	67		
2. Helps children establish one-to-one correspondences		13	29	38	21	39	71		
3. Helps children count objects by rote	8	4	25	21	42	54	46		
Space				%	of Cases				
1. Encourages children to fit things together and take them apart	4	4	20	36	36	36	64		
2. Encourages children to rearrange an object or objects in space	8	13	29	38	13	26	74		
3. Helps children to recognize things and places from different spatial viewpoints	13	48	30	9		27	73		
4. Encourages children to describe spatial positions and relationships	4	36	24	24	12	27	73		
5. Encourages children to describe direction of movement	4	48	35	13		25	75		
6. Encourages children to describe relative distances among things and places	23	50	18	9		30	70		
7. Encourages children to explore the spatial aspects of the classroom and their own bodies		12	36	40	12	27	73		
8. Helps children interpret symbolic representations of spatial relations	9	52	22	13	4	27	73		
9. Helps children distinguish and describe shapes	4		24	16	56	33	67		

Teacher_____

Trainer_____

Date_____

	ATTAINMENT RATING					QUALIFICATIONS			
	Not Observed	No Indication	Some Indication	Substantial Indication	Objective Attained	No Training in Competency Yet	More or Different Training/Experience Needed	Context Impedes Implementation	Teacher Does Not Want to Implement
Time				%	of	Cases			
1. Helps children recognize the beginnings and ends of time periods		4	46	29	21	55	45		
2. Helps children compare time periods	24	76				67	33		
3. Helps children predict future events and prepare for them			50	29	21	50	50		
4. Helps children recall past events			46	29	25	53	47		
5. Helps children to describe sequences of events		38	25	39	8	43	57		
6. The teacher uses conventional time limits accurately and appropriately when talking about past and future	17		29	9	52	67	33		
Feelings				%	of	Cases			
1. Accepts and responds to child's feelings		13	25	8	54	50	42		8
2. Helps child describe his feelings	5	33	33	5	24	35	59		6
3. Helps children cope constructively with feelings(interpersonal and intrapersonal)		22	44	9	26	35	59		6
4. Minimizes occurences of extreme frustration in children		17	25	21	38	47	47		7
Classroom Management				%	of	Cases			
1. Dual-focuses	4	4	24	40	28	39	54	8	
2. Minimizes time spent waiting		4	12	52	32	24	77		
3. Converts harmful or inappropriate behavior into problem-solving situation	4	16	32	36	12	24	71		5
4. Sets reasonable limits, explaining them and maintaining them		8	28	32	32	31	63		6
5. Gives children feedback with reasons		16	32	20	32	31	63		6

Teacher_____

Trainer_____

Date_____

	ATTAINMENT RATING					QUALIFICATIONS			
	Not Observed	No Indication	Some Indication	Substantial Indication	Objective Attained	No Training in Competency Yet	More or Different Training/Experience Needed	Context Impedes Implementation	Teacher Does Not Want to Implement
6. Does not physically punish children			4	4	12	33	33		33
7. Maintains a safe and comfortable environment			4	16	80	25	50		25
Team Evaluation and Planning				%	of	Cases			
1. Meets daily with other classroom staff to evaluate and plan		8	24	32	36	33	67		
2. Keeps dated examples of each child's work over year	57	14	10		19	67	33		
3. Evaluates each child's level of functioning within key experiences		24	48	28		21	71	4	4
Working with Parents				%	of	Cases			
1. Involves the parents in evaluating and planning for child both in and out of school	61		22	6	11	75	25		
2. Shares observations with parents at end of day	67			33		67		33	
3. Holds regular parent meetings: individual and group	61		6	17	17	50		50	
4. Makes educational home visits	69		13		19	100			
5. Encourages parents to work as volunteers in classroom	61	11			28	100			

Use & Development of Written Assessments Measuring Comprehension of Curriculum Topics

For five curriculum areas we developed and used written assessments each requiring the application of curriculum principles to a specific set of classroom situations. These assessments now are a part of the many workshop activities described in the Trainer's Manual . In fact, these assessment activities are as important in stimulating group discussion about curriculum principles as they are for formally evaluating the effectiveness of the workshops. (See example on pages 84-88.)

The location of each of these assessments within the Trainer's Manual is shown in Figure 1. Because a variety of media including slides and videotape were used in the assessments, only the assessments that employ the print medium are entirely understandable from inspection of the Trainer's Manual. In most cases, the assessments were administered about one month after the completion of the workshop on the same topic, thus allowing time for trainees to assimilate the material. During 1975-76, the administration of these assessments was monitored by evaluation staff, and the results were documented. In the next year use of the assessments was monitored individually by each curriculum consultant, and the results were not documented.

LOCATION OF WRITTEN ASSESSMENTS USED FORMALLY DURING 1975 - 1976

WITHIN THE TRAINER'S MANUAL

Topic and Workshop No.	Room Arrangement I	Daily Routine III	Active Learning and Language (in Daily Routine Workshop III)	Experiencing & Representing II	Space I
Media Employed	Slides	Print	Videotape	Print	Slides
Location of Instructions and Materials	Workshop Activity #7, p.53	Workshop Activity #6 p.124 Materials on pp.132-133	Workshop Activity #5 p.124	Workshop Activity #6, p.417 See also Trainer's Supplement pp.432-434	Workshop Activity #7, p.481
Location of Answers	pp.67-73	p.163	pp.139-162	p.435	p.503

FIGURE 1

The following are capsule descriptions of the written assessments:

- Room Arrangement. The trainee's task for the room arrangement assessment was to evaluate each of a series of 12 slides in terms of their illustrations of correct and incorrect applications of room arrangement principles.

- Daily Routine. The task was to evaluate each of the segments of a hypothetical daily routine in terms of consistency with High/Scope principles for scheduling the activities of adults and children.

- Active Learning and Language. This assessment was divided into four sections. Each of these sections was based upon the first part (Example A) of a two-part tape showing contrasting teaching styles during circle time. The first section involved an evaluation of the activity in terms of active learning; the second section involved an evaluation of the activity in terms of the children's opportunities to use language; the third involved an evaluation of the goal of the activity; and the fourth involved a revision of the activity such that it would include more of the active learning and language components from the Cognitive Preschool Curriculum.

- Representation. The task was to recognize which, if any, of the curriculum key experiences for representation were involved in each of a set of hypothetical classroom situations. Additionally, trainees suggested appropriate teaching strategies for each of the situations.

- Spatial Relations. This written assessment consisted of two parts. For Part I, the task was to view seven sets of slides and to write which of the key experiences was depicted by each set. For Part II, the task was to read three descriptions of hypothetical classroom situations and to generate teaching strategies consistent with curriculum principles.

Correlations Between Sections of the PTTP & the Written Assessments

As described in the October, 1975 Special Project Report, we have been explicitly interested in the relationship between a trainee's ability to respond in the verbal-graphic modality to an assessment measuring comprehension and the trainee's actual classroom performance in terms of the same curriculum area tapped by the assessment. We have been assuming that in the context of a training situation similar to that of the Special Project with the opportunities for demonstration teaching, discussions, of concrete classroom situations with the trainer, etc., success on written assessments may not be a necessary prerequisite for attainment of related teaching competencies as measured by an observation checklist.

In other words, the process by which one becomes a competent teacher might proceed effectively without success on written tests measuring verbal and written comprehension of curriculum concepts. There are two possible reasons for this hypothesized outcome: First, the ability to "output" answers in written form in response to test-like stimuli may be only marginally related to the development of skills as a preschool teacher. Second, some trainees may not achieve comprehension of concepts after participation in a workshop, but they may achieve such comprehension through active attempts to employ a given set of teaching strategies.

Our data sets from the PTTP and the written assessments did not produce significant correlations, or even a consistent pattern of correlations, between sections of the PTTP and corresponding paper and pencil asssessments. This lack of relationship occurred even when we analyzed the categories of "teachers" and "aides" separately and when we used the field centers as the units of analysis.

In contrast, the intercorrelations among the PTTP sections were more consistent. All of the intercorrelations for the sections of the PTTP were positive and extremely strong -- the weakest correlation was associated with a probability level $< .004$. The intercorrelations for the written assessments are shown in Table 3. Although not as orderly as the intercorrelations for the PTTP, they reveal a fairly consistent pattern of positive correlations. Thus, the lack of relationship between the PTTP and written assessments cannot be attributed mainly to "noise" within each group of instruments.

Table 3

Intercorrelations of Written Assessments

	Room Arrangement		Daily Routine		Action & Language		Representation	
	N	rho	N	rho	N	rho	N	rho
Room Arrangement								
Daily Routine	(51)	.42**						
Action and Language	(42)	.23	(35)	.67**				
Representation	(24)	-.25	(26)	.43*	(19)	.41		
Space	(14)	.54*	(16)	.39	(15)	.63**	(15)	.47

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

The results reinforce our confidence in the practical importance of this domain of investigation. We believe that our training model permits a more naturalistic and situationally valid analysis of the development of teaching competencies than the models afforded by many colleges of education, including those attempting to employ a competency based system. In turn, our analysis suggests that the High/Scope teacher training model provided more avenues to the development of teaching skills than do traditional models.

Name_____

Center_____

HIGH/SCOPE EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH FOUNDATION

Copyright © 1976

Assessment for Experiencing and Representing

Part I

Described below are some preschool classroom situations. Each situation may or may not involve key experiences from the topic of Experiencing and Representing. Please read each situation and write down the key experience(s) involved, if any. You may put the key experience(s) in your own words, but you need to do more than repeat the information already described in the situation.

Example:

Sample situation: At small group time Phil reads a story book to the children in his group about "Toby the Toothbrush." Phil sometimes points to the words while reading them.

Answer 1. Phil reads to the children
Answer 2. Phil is showing the children that words can be said aloud and written down too.

In this example, Answer 1 only repeats the information already written in the situation. So, Answer 1 would not tell us whether or not you had really identified the key experience involved in the situation. Answer 2 is useful because it describes the key experience, i.e., Observing that spoken words can be written down and read back.

1. Yvonnea, Joe and Buffie have made a plan to listen to some records. They put on a sound with a good beat. Yvonnea says, "I know how to shake my hips!" As she does some steps from the "Scoville Hustle." Joe and Buffie try to follow the steps Yvonnea is doing.

2. Phillip notices that Hans and Jose have set up a grocery store in the house area. They have also used some boards taken from the block area to make a counter. Jose asks Phillip what he wants to buy, and Phil asks him in return, "What is on sale?"

3. Bobby calls Elaine over to the Art Area to admire his painting. He tells her to get a pen so she can write down his story about his painting. Elaine writes Bobby's story about his painting, then helps him make a new plan.

4. Elaine noticed that Jessica seemed to be stumped on where to go next with the batmobile she had been working on during the week. Elaine reviewed with Jessica what she had already done and discussed possible additions. Jessica said she could not remember what else went on the car. Elaine suggested that maybe Jessica could ask David for his Batman comic book and ask him for ideas. After looking at the comic book, Jessica starts to paint a bat on her car.

5. In the meantime, Phil is working with five children who planned to make soup. The children busy themselves washing, scraping and cutting carrots, potatoes and celery and putting pieces in the broth. Antoine seems to be confused about what goes in the pot and tosses in a plastic onion. Phillip fishes the intruder out and takes a few minutes to compare the real onion with the pretend onion.

6. Now, it is just before time to go outside. Phil is helping Andrea put on her overshoes. Andrea does not have any baggies with her to put over her shoes, and Phil is having trouble. While all of this is going on, Phil can hear the dumptruck making its daily stop across the street. Phil asks Andrea if she knows what is making that sound.

7. During activity time, Markie asks Elaine to push him on the wooden taxi. Elaine would like to involve Markie in play with the other children so she "loads up" the taxi with two other children besides Markie. Then, she stops pushing and says, "O.K., someone else needs to push now."

8. At her small group time Elaine puts piles of shredded ribbons and sections of used computer cards on her table with glue and crayons. The children make collages with these materials.

9. Phil's group had eaten real vegetable soup at snack time. During small group time, Phil has his group draw pictures of the different things found in their soup.

Name_____

Center_____

HIGH/SCOPE EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH FOUNDATION
600 North River Street
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Copyright © 1976

Assessment for Experiencing and Representing

Part II

For situations #1, #2, #5, #6, #8, and #9, describe the teaching strategies you would use to facilitate the children's representational activities.

Situation 1.

Situation 2.

Situation 5.

Situation 6.

Situation 8.

Situation 9.

Evaluation of High/Scope Field Service

In the Spring of 1976 and of 1977 we asked individuals associated with our training centers to complete questionnaires on the High/Scope field services program. The purpose of this procedure has been to obtain systematic feedback on trainees' perceptions of the High/Scope field service program. The feedback received has helped us improve the program.

The questionnaire was revised in 1977 and a copy is included on pages 90-96. For 1977, we received 105 completed questionnaires. The average response to the first item, "Please give your opinion of the overall quality of the High/Scope field service program was "very good." The average response to item four -- the extent to which the High/Scope curriculum had been implemented -- was "To a moderate extent." Because the other questions encouraged extremely heterogeneous responses, we have not quantified the results, but have closely examined them.

High/Scope Educational Research Foundation

600 North River Street
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197
(313) 485-2000

David P. Weikart, Ph.D.
President

April 28, 1977

HIGH/SCOPE-BEH Special Project End-of-Year Inservice Training Evaluation

NAME _____

CENTER _____

DATE _____

HOW LONG IN H/S PROGRAM? _____

Before completing the rest of this form, please give your opinion of the overall quality of the High/Scope field service program.

Check one:

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

1a. In your opinion, what have been the strongest elements of the training program?

1b. What parts of the training program could be improved to meet your needs more satisfactorily?

2. What are you doing differently as a result of the High/Scope training sessions? (For example, you could discuss training sessions in Daily Routine, Room Arrangement, Key Experiences: encouraging Active Learning, Language Development, Representation, Classification, Seriation, Spatial Relations, Temporal Relations, Child Observation and Evaluation, Team Teaching and Planning, Children's Feelings and conflict situations.)

3. What major differences have you noticed in the children in your class that might be a result of these changes?

4. How would you describe the extent to which you have implemented the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum? Please check one:

Not at all _____ To a Moderate Extent _____

To a Small Extent ____ To a Large Extent _____

5. Are there things you would like to do differently in your room but cannot? What are the barriers?

6. If you continue working with High/Scope, in what areas would you like more work?

7. During classroom visits and observations, your High/Scope consultant may have played each of these roles -- observer and commenter, participant, and demonstration teacher.

a. Please put a check beside each role you found to be beneficial:

_____ observer and commenter

_____ participant

_____ demonstration teacher

b. For any of these roles you did not find to be beneficial, please explain why:

c. What, if anything, would you like to have changed about the classroom visits and observations?

d. What would you have liked more of?

_____: field visits to your classroom (if so, how frequent? _____)

_____: workshops

_____: intern weeks at High/Scope

_____: written materials

_____: other (list)

e. What, if anything, would you like to have changed about the inservice workshops?

9. During classroom visits and observations, your local support person (Parent Trainer or Curriculum Assistant) may have played each of these roles -- observer and commenter, participant, and demonstration teacher.

a. Please put a check beside each role you found to be beneficial:

_____ observer and commenter

_____ participant

_____ demonstration teacher

b. For any of these roles you did not find to be beneficial, please explain why.

c. Did you feel that classroom visits and observations occurred often enough, too often, or not often enough?

d. What, if anything, would you like to have changed about the classroom visits and observations?

10. What additional training materials do you feel High/Scope needs to develop for teachers who work with handicapped children?

11. Please give your responses to the High/Scope Curriculum materials you have used:

a. In what way was the field draft of the Cognitively Oriented Preschool Curriculum book helpful to you?

b. How could the book be improved to better meet your needs?

c. In what ways were the audiovisual materials (films, tapes, etc.) helpful to you?

d. What changes, if any, do you think would make the audiovisual materials more useful?

e. In what ways was the written feedback from your High/Scope consultant (e.g. observation reports, workshop summaries) useful to you? Could it be improved to better meet your needs?

Development of a Screening Instrument for the Assessment of Trainee's Values Regarding Child Development

- Lucrecia Peters
- Robert D. Matz

Our experience has indicated that the teacher training process can be designed somewhat differently for those teachers whose individual value systems, or intuitive philosophies of child development initially are congruent with the ethos of the Cognitive Preschool Curriculum than for those whose value systems are not. Thus, we are interested in developing a cost-effective means of screening trainees on this dimension.

During 1976-77 we developed a 105 item Q-sort, which contained 6 separate factors -- warmth, self-reliance, and initiative emphasis, consistent structuring, and willingness to exert control.[1] The instructions for Q-sorting and the teacher value factors are shown on pages 98 - 116.

We tried out the Q-sort with approximately 40 trainees. The results indicated that the instructions are quite clear and that the task can be completed in a reasonable amount of time. Further work is needed to validate the effectiveness of the Q-sort as a tool in teacher training.

---

1 Many of the Q-sort items were obtained from a dissertation by Thelma Harms -- The Relationship Between Teaching Strategies and the Educational Orientation of Preschool Teachers. U.C. Berkeley, 1975.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR Q-SORTING

The Teacher Value Q-Sort, consisting of 105 items, has been constructed as a self-descriptive device for preschool teachers to use in describing their beliefs and practices with regard to young children.

Q-Sorting procedure:

In the packet you will find:

A. 105 small cards
B. 7 envelopes labeled as follows:
   7 - Most Descriptive of Me
   6 - Quite Descriptive of Me
   5 - Fairly Descriptive of Me
   4 - Neither Descriptive nor Undescriptive of Me
   3 - Fairly Undescriptive of Me
   2 - Quite Undescriptive of Me
   1 - Most Undescriptive of Me
C. A return envelope for your sorted cards.

The 105 cards are to be arranged into 7 catagories, corresponding to the labeled envelopes. We are asking that you place 15 cards in each of the 7 categories.

Here is how you proceed:

(1) Lay the 7 envelopes out across the table in numerical order so that you can keep the two ends of the distribution and the meanings of the categories clearly in mind as you sort.

(2) Take the deck of cards and shuffle them a bit first.

(3) Go through all the cards and arrange them in 3 piles: one pile for the statements which, for the most part, are descriptive of you, one pile for those which, for the most part, are not descriptive, and a middle pile for those in between the two extremes. It does not make any difference how many cards you put in each of these 3 piles, but you will find it a bit more convenient if each pile contains roughly the same number. It helps if you have the space to keep the cards spread out so you can read and compare them at a glance.

(4) Now, take the pile containing cards that you have said describe you and pick out 15 cards which are the most descriptive of your behavior and beliefs. Put these on top of envelope number 7. Do not put them inside yet, as you might want to change some of them later.

(5) Next, pick the 15 cards which you think are quite descriptive of you and put these on top of envelope number 6.

(6) Next, pick the 15 cards which you think are fairly descriptive of you and put these on top of envelope number 5.

(7) Now it is best to begin at the other end. Take the pile containing cards which, for the most part, are not descriptive and pick out those 15 cards which are least descriptive of you. Put these on top of envelope number 1, Most Undescriptive of Me.

(8) Then pick out the 15 cards that are quite undescriptive and put them on envelope number 2.

(9) Now, pick out the 15 cards that are fairly undescriptive and put them on envelope number 3.

(10) In all, you will now have 15 cards left over. These could be put into envelope 4, Neither Descriptive nor Undescriptive.

(11) IMPORTANT. Finally, you should check all 7 piles to see if there are 15 cards in each. If you now want to change your mind about the position of a card, you can exchange it for another, but be sure that there are always 15 in each pile. When you are finished, you can put the cards in the envelopes where they belong and seal the envelopes.

(12) Put all 7 envelopes into the large envelope addressed to High/Scope and mail as soon as possible.

You, as many others, may find it difficult to put exactly 15 cards in each envelope. Perhaps you may wish to put more in some envelopes and fewer in others. We must, nevertheless, ask that you follow these directions exactly, in spite of the restraint you may feel.

Good sorting!

THANK YOU

1. I encourage children to develop and discuss their own opinions.	9. I feel that through a child's activities and and achievements, he learns to see himself as a competent person.	17. I think it is good practice for a child to perform in front of others
2. I think that teachers should decide what children are going to do and learn at school.	10. I believe it is important to begin teaching school skills early.	18. I openly express my affection to children.
3. I worry about the academic pressures put on children.	11. I feel a child should be given comfort and understanding when he is scared or upset.	19. I find some of my greatest satisfactions in my work with the children.
4. I believe children are capable of planning their activities and how they are going to do them.	12. I think that children should not be exposed to ideas or values differing from their own family's until they are older.	20. I prefer that a child not try things if there is a chance he will fail.
5. I often feel angry with the children.	13. I believe one of the major purposes of preschool education is to help children prepare for first grade.	21. I encourage children to wonder and think about life.
6. If a child gets into trouble, I expect him to handle the problem mostly by himself.	14. Sometimes I find that physical punishment is necessary for disciplining a child.	22. I usually take into account the children's preferences in making plans for the group.
7. I punish a child by putting him off by himself for a while.	15. I believe a child should not be assertive or demanding.	23. I think that sometimes children are being encouraged to grow up too fast.
8. I tend to avoid scheduling activities that are messy and difficult to clean up.	16. I sometimes forget the promises I have made to the children.	24. I feel a child should be allowed some school time to himself.

25. I think it is better for a teacher to be like "just one of the kids" than to assume a powerful role.	33. I expect a great deal of the children.	41. I give the children a good many duties and school responsibilities.
26. I let children make many decisions for themselves.	34. I am easy going and relaxed with children.	42. The children and I have warm, close feelings for each other.
27. I do not allow a child to say bad things about adults.	35. I carefully plan the activities for the day.	43. I have firm, well-established rules for the children.
28. I believe that real tools and equipment are too dangerous for preschoolers.	36. I tend to spoil children.	44. I think one has to let a child take many chances as he grows up and tries new things.
29. I teach a child that in one way or another punishment will find him when he is bad.	37. I am flexible and follow the spontaneous interests of the children.	45. I encourage the children to be curious, to explor and question thing
30. I believe that preschoolers are too young to make choices and decisions.	38. I talk it over and reason with a child when he misbehaves.	46. I believe one of the major purposes of preschool education is to help children learn to reason.
31. I do not allow a child to get angry with me.	39. I trust the children to behave as they should even when I am not with them.	47. Children's learnin is a gradual process, in my opinion.
32. I am more of an "observer" than a "doer" in the classroom.	40. I believe teachers should help children solve problems by showing them the most effective way.	48. I think that using test results is generally better than teacher obser vation in planning for children.

49. I think adults too often interfere with children.	57. I feel that not all children can learn the same things in in the same ways.	65. I think a teacher should work within the reasoning skills a child has already developed.
50. I threaten punishment more often than I actually give it.	58. I try to provide the children with a wide variety of materials to work with.	66. I sometimes tease the children.
51. I believe praising a child when he is good gets better results than punishing him when he is bad.	59. I think a child should be encouraged to do things better than others.	67. I teach a child that he is responsible for what happens to him.
52. I make sure the children know that I appreciate what they try or accomplish.	60. I punish a child by taking away a privilege he otherwise would have had.	68. I think that a goo way to find out what preschoolers have learned about the concept of number is to see i they can count.
53. I encourage a child to talk about his troubles.	61. I think it is important to give children tangible rewards when they behave well.	69. I find myself getting into conflicts with children.
54. I make sure the children put things back after they are finished using them.	62. I enjoy having children around me.	70. I don't allow the children to questi me about my decisions.
55. I teach a child to keep control of his feelings at all times.	63. I think that a teacher should stretch the minds of the children by presenting material just beyond their present reasoning skills.	71. I believe that mos preschool children are too immature to follow rules in the classroom.
56. I try to keep children from hitting and fighting.	64. I believe that criticism makes a child improve.	72. I think that in order to be effective, a teache must have some understanding of how children mentally construct the world and how this changes in the course of development.

73. I encourage children to talk to each other about what they are doing.	81. I think arguing and quarreling among the children should be stopped.	89. I don't allow the children to tease or play tricks on each other.
74. I want my children to make a good impression on others.	82. I think children must learn early to control their emotions.	90. I think that boys and girls should have different kinds of toys and play different sorts of games.
75. I encourage the children to be independent of me.	83. I believe it is important not to let things interfere with the plans I have made for the day.	91. I feel that a noisy environment is not condusive to learning.
76. Some of a child's efforts should come from his or her own interests in my opinion.	84. I think children should learn the consequences of their own actions	92. I think the children must learn to confrom to the routines.
77. I find it stimulating to be with children.	85. I find that I can usually trust children.	93. I believe children should learn to assert their rights from the earliest age.
78. I feel children learn best by discovering things for themselves.	86. I think it is important for young children to be able to predict what will happen next during the day.	94. I believe that children will learn more from the kind of person I am than from anything I try to teach them.
79. Often other children are a child's best teacher in my opinion.	87. I believe a child learns a great deal from playing out of doors.	95. I think it is important always to be consistent with children.
80. I feel that learning does not always occur when children are involved in activities of their own design.	88. I think it is important for children to fit into the group.	96. My moods invluence the way I behave with the children.

97. I try to ignore a child's negative behavior.

98. I believe teachers must help children extend their activities in productive and meaningful ways.

99. I try to provide materials that can be used in many different ways.

100. I think it is important for teachers to try to keep young children from acquiring incorrect facts about the world.

101. I think that children can often help each other solve problems.

102. I believe the fewer materials available, the easier it is for a child to concentrate on his task.

103. I try to make things more interesting by varying the order of events in the day.

104. I think that nine times out of ten, teachers should allow children to work out their own social problems.

105. I believe that teachers usually interfere with children's creativity when they involve themselves in their activities.

Teacher Value Factors

FACTOR 1

WARMTH

Positive Items

19		I find some of my greatest satisfactions in my work with the children.
62		I enjoy having children around me.
42		The children and I have warm, close feelings for each other.
77		I find it stimulating to be with children.
11		I feel a child should be given comfort and understanding when he is scared or upset.
52		I make sure the children know that I appreciate what they try or accomplish.
34		I am easy going and relaxed with children.
18		I openly express my affection to children.
94		I believe that children will learn more from the kind of person I am than from anything I try to teach them.
53		I encourage a child to talk about his troubles.
85	*	I find that I can usually trust children.
22		I usually take into account the children's preferences in making plans for the group.

Total 12 Items

* indicates a new item

FACTOR 1

WARMTH

Negative Items

31		I do not allow a child to get angry with me.
70		I don't allow children to question me about my decisions.
69		I find myself getting into conflicts with children.
96		My moods influence the way I behave with the children.
15		I believe a child should not be assertive or demanding.
55		I teach a child to keep control of his feelings at all times.
29		I teach a child that in one way or another punishment will find him when he is bad.
64		I believe that criticism makes a child improve.
14		Sometimes I find that physical punishment is necessary for disciplining a child.
5		I often feel angry with the children.
2	*	I think that teachers should decide what children are going to do and learn at school.
6		If a child gets into trouble, I expect him to handle the problem mostly by himself.

Total 12 Items

FACTOR 2

SELF-RELIANCE AND INITIATIVE

EMPHASIS

Positive Items

67 I teach a child that he is responsible for what happens to him.

75 I encourage the children to be independent of me.

39 I trust the children to behave as they should, even when I am not with them.

84 I think children should learn the consequences of their own actions.

4 * I believe children are capable of planning their activities and how they are going to do them.

1 I encourage children to develop and discuss their own opinions.

26 I let children make many decisions for themselves.

49 I think adults too often interfere with children.

93 I believe children should learn to assert their rights from the earliest age.

37 I am flexible and follow the spontaneous interests of the children.

54 I make sure children put things back after they are finished using them.

44 I think one has to let a child take many chances as he grows up and tries new things.

9 * I feel that through a child's activities and achievements, he learns to see himself as a competent person.

24 I feel a child should be allowed some school time to himself.

Total 14 Items

FACTOR 2

SELF-RELIANCE AND INITIATIVE

EMPHASIS

Negative Items

70 I don't allow children to question me about my decisions.

31 I do not allow a child to get angry with me.

88 I think it is important for children to fit into the group.

61 I think it is important to give children tangible rewards when they behave well.

29 I teach a child that in one way or another punishment will find him when he is bad.

13 * I believe one of the major purposes for preschool education is to help children prepare for first grade.

64 I believe that criticism makes a child improve.

15 I believe a child should not be assertive or demanding.

28 * I believe that real tools and equipment are too dangerous for preschoolers.

2 * I think that teachers should decide what children are going to do and learn at school.

30 * I believe that preschoolers are too young to make choices and decisions.

92 I think children must learn to conform to the routine.

20 I prefer that a child not try things if there is a chance he will fail.

40 * I believe teachers should help children solve problems by showing them the most effective way.

Total 14 Items

FACTOR 3

DEVELOPMENTAL EMPHASIS

Positive Items

37		I am flexible and follow the spontaneous interests of the children.
35		I carefully plan the activities for the day.
46	*	I believe one of the major purposes for preschool education is to help children learn to reason.
47	*	Children's learning is a gradual process in my opinion.
57	*	I feel that not all children can learn the same things in the same ways.
72	*	I think that in order to be effective, a teacher must have some understanding of how children mentally construct the world and how this changes in the course of development.
65	*	I think a teacher should work within the reasoning skills a child has already developed.
23		I think that sometimes children are being encouraged to grow up too fast.
3		I worry about the academic pressures put on children.
24		I feel a child should be allowed some school time to himself.
49		I think adults too often interfere with children.
58	*	I try to provide the children with a wide variety of materials to work with.
99	*	I try to provide materials that can be used by the children in many different ways.

Total 13 Items

FACTOR 3

DEVELOPMENTAL EMPHASIS

Negative Items

13	*	I believe one of the major purposes for preschool education is to help children prepare for first grade.
90		I think that bosy and girls should have different kinds of toys and play different sorts of games.
40	*	I believe teachers should help children solve problems by showing them the most effective way.
48	*	I think that using test results is generally better than teacher observations in planning for children.
63	*	I think that a teacher should stretch the minds of children by presenting material just beyond their present reasoning skills.
68	*	A good way to find out what preschoolers have learned about the concept of number is to see if they can count.
10		I believe it is important to begin teaching school skills early.
17		I think it is good practice for a child to perform in front of others.
82		I think children must learn to control their emotions.
64		I believe that criticism makes a child improve.
59		I think a child should be encouraged to do things better than others.
33		I expect a great deal of the children.
100	*	I think it is important for teachers to try to keep young children from acquiring incorrect facts about the world.

Total 1? Items

FACTOR 4

ACTIVE LEARNING EMPHASIS

Positive Items

87		I believe a child learns a great deal from playing out of doors.
45		I encourage the children to be curious, to explore and question things.
78		I feel children learn by discovering things for themselves.
73	*	I encourage children to talk to each other about what they are doing.
22		I usually take into account the children's preferences in making plans for the group.
1		I encourage children to develop and discuss their own opinions.
21		I encourage children to wonder and think about life.
44		I think one has to let a child take many chances as he grows up and tries new things.
76	*	Some of a child's efforts in school should come from his or her own interests.
79	*	Often other children are a child's best teacher in my opinion.
58	*	I try to provide the children with a wide variety of materials to work with.
57	*	I feel that not all children can learn the same things in the same ways.
101	*	I think that children can often help each other solve problems.

Total 13 Items

FACTOR 4

ACTIVE LEARNING EMPHASIS

Negative Items

36		I tend to spoil children.
12		I think that children should not be exposed to ideas or values differing from their own family's until they are older.
39		I trust the children to behave as they should, even when I am not with them.
27		I do not allow a child to say bad things about adults.
8		I tend to avoid scheduling activities that are messy and difficult to clean up.
2	*	I think that teachers should decide what children are going to do and learn at school.
80	*	I feel that learning does not always occur when children are involved in activities of their own design.
91	*	I feel that a noisy environment is not condusive to learning.
28	*	I believe that real tools and equipment are too dangerous for preschoolers.
83	*	I believe it is important not to let things interfere with the plans I have made for the day.
30	*	I believe that preschoolers are too young to make choices and decisions.
20		I prefer that a child not try things if there is a chance he will fail.
102	*	I believe the fewer materials available the easier it is for a child to consentrate on his task.

Total 13 Items

FACTOR 5

CONSISTENT STRUCTURING

Positive Items

43 I have firm, well-established rules for the children.

51 I believe praising a child when he is good gets better results than punishing him when he is bad.

95 I think it is important always to be consistent with the children.

52 I make sure the children know that I appreciate what they try or accomplish.

54 I make sure the children put things back after they are finished using them.

41 I give the children a good many duties and school responsibilities.

35 I carefully plan the activities for the day.

92 I think the children must learn to conform to the routines.

94 I believe that children will learn more from the kind of person I am than from anything I try to teach them.

86 * I think it is important for young children to be able to predict what will happen next during the day.

Total 10 Items

FACTOR 5

CONSISTENT STRUCTURING

Negative Items

-	29	I teach a child that in one way or another punishment will find him when he is bad
	66	I sometimes tease the children.
	16	I sometimes forget the promises I have made to the children.
	64	I believe that criticism makes a child improve.
	50	I threaten punishment more often than I actually give it.
	96	My moods influence the way I behave with the children.
	90	I think that boys and girls should have different kinds of toys and play different sorts of games.
	36	I tend to spoil the children.
	103 *	I try to make things more interesting by varying the order of events in the day.
	71 *	I believe that most preschool children are too immature to follow rules in the classroom

Total 10 Items

FACTOR 6

WILLINGNESS TO EXERT CONTROL

Positive Items

7		I punish a child by putting him off by himself for a while.
60		I punish a child by taking away a priviledge he otherwise would have had.
74		I want my children to make a good impression on others.
75		I encourage the children to be independent of me.
56		I try to keep children from hitting and fighting.
81		I think arguing and quarreling among the children should be stopped.
89		I don't allow the children to tease or play tricks on others.
38		I talk it over and reason with a child when he misbehaves.
98	*	I believe teachers must help children extend their activities in productive and meaningful ways.
43.		I have firm well-established rules for the children.

Total 10 Items

FACTOR 6

WILLINGNESS TO EXERT CONTROL

Negative Items

49		I think adults too often interfere with children.
29		I teach a child that in one way or another punishment will find him when he is bad.
6		If a child gets into trouble, I expect him to handle the problem mostly by himself.
36		I tend to spoil children.
97	*	I try to ignore a child's negative behavior.
104	*	I think that nine times out of ten, teachers should allow children to work out their own social problems.
105	*	I believe that teachers usually interfere with children's creativity when they involve themselves in their activities.
71	*	I believe that most preschool children are to immature to follow rules in the classroom.
25	*	I think it is better for a teacher to be "just one of the kids" than to assume a powerful role.
32	*	I am more of an "observer" than a " doer" in the classroom.

Total 10 Items

INSERVICE TRAINING OF THE HIGH/SCOPE STAFF

One goal of the project was to increase the number and skills of consultants trained at High/Scope Foundation in Ypsilanti to disseminate the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum. Training was provided for eleven consultants.

During 1974-1975 and 1975-1976 Linda Rogers, as staff development coordinator, provided seminars and practicum supervision to consultants-in-training. These have been described in previous reports of the Special Project and High/Scope Demonstration Preschool Project. As consultants moved from trainee status and classroom teaching roles to field consultant status ongoing supervision was provided by Carole Thomson, field services coordinator for the Preschool Department.

The Project's inservice training process in 1974-1975 was a prototype for the High/Scope Foundation's Graduate Program in Education and Human Development which was initiated in 1976-1977.

High/Scope Foundation's Graduate Program

During the academic year 1976-77, a masters-level program in Education and Human Development was implemented with four students. The program is offered in cooperation with three accredited institutions: Pacific Oaks College, Pasadena, California, Merrill-Palmer Institute, Detroit, Michigan, and Bank Street College, New York, New York.

A working agreement was signed in the fall of 1976 with Pacific Oaks College. It was agreed to offer a joint program where two semesters would be spent at High/Scope and the remaining course work and a master's thesis completed at Pacific Oaks.

A similar agreement was completed with Merrill-Palmer Institute during the academic year. Negotiations are progressing with Bank Street College. A number of cross-institution visits have occurred and discussions continue toward an agreement.

All four students have elected to complete their degree at Pacific Oaks during the summer of 1977. Definition of their thesis topics were outgrowths of individual projects begun at High/Scope.

Inservice Training for Project Staff and Graduate Program

The High/Scope Graduate Program was used this year as the primary vehicle for staff inservice training. It was felt this would provide the broadest training experience, and it was directly linked anyway, since the staff to be trained were part of the training classrooms to be used.

The breadth of knowledge about the theory and curriculum was provided by having new staff and interested former staff attend the seminars presented by the Graduate Program. Following is an outline of the subject matter presented.

The Child as Active Learner
(3 hours weekly in the fall)

The Psychology of the Child from a Piagetian viewpoint:

- Stages of cognitive development. Assessing the developmental status of children from infancy through adolescence; planning for children according to their developmental status; learning as an active, adaptive process; the role of language in cognitive development.

- Social experience and development. Children's growth in taking the perspectives of other people; moral development; processes of interaction between children and between adults and children, in classroom groups and in families.

The High/Scope Curriculum in Practice
(2 hours weekly in the fall)

The application of cognitive-developmental theory in educational settings:

- Review of High/Scope programs. Principles of cognitive development as they are applied in High/Scope educational program from infancy through adolescence.

- The curriculum framework. Fundamental assumptions of the High/Scope Curriculum; how to coordinate planning by children and teachers; the teacher and the parent as facilitators of child development; arranging the environment and establishing a daily routine which support active learning.

Introduction to Educational Research
(equivalent of 1 hour weekly in the fall)

Developing skills for educational research; reading research reports; designing, executing, and reporting one's own student project.

Strategies for Curriculum Implementation
(3 hours weekly in the spring)

Guidelines for making the decisions which affect the implementation of the High/Scope Curriculum:

- Supporting general cognitive development. Recognizing and supporting the child's development of representation, classification, number, time, space, and logical and physical relations.

- Supporting cognitive development in the content areas. Art, music, movement, drama, and play, construction, sewing, science, and social studies as modes of active learning; supporting and broadening the child's development of speaking, reading, writing, and mathematical abilities and their antecedents.

- The curriculum in school and community. Insuring the success of an innovative curriculum in the school, the preschool center, and the home; the roles of administrator, consultant, and teacher trainer; discussing educational issues and activities with parents.

In addition to attending seminars, trainees were responsible for implementing the curriculum in a classroom setting. Observations were made by Foundation staff, feedback was provided and strategies suggested.

Observations were made by Preschool and Graduate Program staff. When possible, these observers also sat in on the classroom team-planning sessions.

The classroom training experience allowed trainees to actively implement a specific curriculum. They were expected to team plan and evaluate daily, discussing curriculum and child issues. Information from these daily sessions were used, with personal observations to complete "Child Observation Records" and case studies of special-project children, to consistently provide meaningful experiences to children and serve as a basis for future classroom directions.

Opportunity was also provided later in the year for trainees to test their knowledge of the curriculum in a training situation when field-site personnel came to the Foundation facility for a week-long session. New staff worked with more experienced staff to plan and present training experience and materials.

With funds from a private grant to the Foundation, the training experience was expanded to providing service to several field sites using the High/Scope model. Trainees planned and worked with Foundation field staff in presenting training workshops and field observations with feedback to those classrooms visited.

Trainees also actively praticipated with Foundation staff in presenting several workshop sessions at the High/Scope Spring Conference, May, 1977. These were presented to a broad range of professionals.

A linking force among these experiences was the extensive use of Foundation-produced training materials. Among these were: written publications, observation instruments, assessment instruments, and audio-visual materials.

The principal texts for seminars were by Ginsberg and Opper, Piaget's Theory of Intellectual Development, and the new Cognitively Oriented Preschool Curriculum teacher's manual by Hohmann, Banet, and Weikart.

In addition to the above-mentioned activities, graduate students took part in other activities specifically associated with and required by the Graduate Program. The following are some of those activities.

Observation

At the beginning of the school year, guided observations will be made of Foundation programs at the levels of infancy, preschool, elementary, middle-school, and later adolescence. The purpose of these observations will be to provide the student with general knowledge of the stages of cognitive development and the translation of those stages into a developmentally suitable curriculum and setting.

Practicums

Central to the High/Scope Graduate Program is the application of cognitive-developmental theory to educational settings. In order to provide students with opportunities to develop competence in this area, a large portion of their time is spent in practicums. The student is involved in 15 sessions of observation, 40 sessions of team teaching with 1 hour per session of practicum planning and evaluation, and 20 sessions of interactions with parents. (equivalent of 5 credit-hours in the fall, 5 inthe spring)

Team teaching

After the student has gained an understanding of developmental theory through seminars and readings, he or she will be asked to apply that knowledge in a Foundation program setting. Students will be teamed with program staffs as they implement the curriculum at their chosen level. Along with the application of theory, students will be asked to provide for the individual needs of children and assess their progress using Foundation-developed instruments, personal observation and recording, audio and videotape samples, annotated records, and paired observations.

Team planning and evaluation

After each classroom session, the information gained from the experience is evaluated with staff team members. Children and program are discussed and plans and strategies devised to broaden the experiences appropriate to the developmental levels of individual children. Curriculum goals are discussed, and plans are made for the next day's activities.

Interactions with parents

"Parent practicums" are designed to prepare students for creative interaction with parents of children in their classes. Over the course of the year, students will be expected to make regular biweekly home visits to selected families. Students will also be expected to encourage all parents to observe in the classroom and attend parent meetings.

Student Projects

In consultation with a member of the Foundation staff, the student will conduct an organized inquiry into some program-related topic of personal interest. A project report is required, to provide evidence of the student's professional learning and growth. A plan for the design, execution, and report of the project will be agreed upon in the fall. A wide range of projects are acceptable. (equivalent of 1 hour weekly in the fall, 1 hour weekly in the spring)

Past Training

In previous years various inservice training models have been tried and have met with varying amounts of success. The first year of the project, training occurred directly in the classroom with one person identified as the master teacher and trainer. This person taught in one of the classrooms and supervised the other classroom. The practicum training was augmented with meetings to discuss curriculum-related topics.

There were several shortcomings of this model. It was impossible for the trainer to both teach and attend to the other responsibilities of training; observation, feedback, and discussion preparation. In addition it was felt by the trainees that a greater emphasis needed to be placed on the theory of the model.

The second year of inservice training, a trainer was identified who was not directly responsible for classroom teaching. Seminars on child development topics were planned on a bi-weekly basis and a monthly inservice workshop for trainees planned. While this provided greater breadth of information to trainees, there were difficulties with the consistency of training.

The inconsistency occurred for several reasons and in several areas. The trainees were rotated through the classrooms in an inconsistent manner due to a shortage of staff. This was rectified in part by hiring an additional staff member at mid-year. Seminars became inconsistent as staff and trainer time was taken up with other aspects of the project. With the addition of new staff, it became necessary to individualize the training as trainees were at various levels of training. In addition the primary trainer was also involved in field training making it impossible to consistently train and make observations at so many levels.

This year's model of using the Graduate Program to supply the seminar needs and a mixture of personnel to supervise classroom training successfully met the needs of providing continuity in seminars but not classsroom supervision. However, it becomes increasingly more apparent that a trainer needs to be identified whose responsibility would be consistent classroom training and coordination of practicum training and seminar presentation.

Both this year's head teacher, Sharon Bixby, and new staff member, Bill Fabricius, participated in the graduate training seminars this year. Content of the seminars was implemented in the classroom by these two people as well as the graduate students, serving as teaching assistants. Sharon also observed the afternoon class weekly for the first semester, and gave written feedback, but found it impossible to attend planning and evaluation sessions with the PM teachers because they planned while she taught the other class. Her role as head teacher mainly included overall coordination and operation of the classroom, formulating class lists and coordinating services with other agencies.

The personnel listed below in their present positions have been trained as a part of the BEH Special Project:

- Marilyn Adams, H/S staff member, served as Latin America consultant and currently as bilingual project language specialist
- Isabel Flores, co-director of H/S bilingual/bicultural project
- Joanna Phinney, H/S consultant
- Sara Jane Adler, H/S consultant

- Susan Shipstead, served as H/S consultant for one year following training, and is currently pursuing Ph.D. studies in child development at Stanford University.

- Al Brown, served as H/S teacher/consultant and is currently a Ph.D. student in special education at the University of Michigan.

- William Fabricius, High/Scope Consultant

- Elisabeth Schaefer, Teacher, High/Scope Staff Training & Curriculum Demonstration Center

- Jacqueline Kann, Teacher, High/Scope Staff Training & Curriculum Demonstration Center

- Deborah Dobay, Early Childhood Education Instructor, Chemeketa Community College, Salem, Oregon

- Lucrecia Peters, Teacher, Demonstration School and Child Development Instructor, Central Washington State College, Ellensburg, Washington.

REPLICATION/DISSEMINATION OF THE TRAINING

The work of the Special Project will be continued by two new High/Scope BEH Projects: Outreach and Training. Abstracts of these projects are found on the following pages.

A technical assistance contract with the Special Education Services Division of the New Jersey Department of Education will also continue the work completed under the original project.

High/Scope Educational Research Foundation

600 North River Street
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197
(313) 485-2000

David P. Weikart, Ph.D.
President

1977-78

SUMMARY OF THE
HIGH/SCOPE FOUNDATION FIRST CHANCE OUTREACH PROJECT

The purpose of the project is to strengthen an existing network of replication sites, to disseminate a training system based on multi-media learning packages, and to provide an orientation to High/Scope's preschool curriculum and teacher training model for regional resource clearinghouses and early childhood special educators across the country.

Methods and Procedures

The project provides continued on-site training and consultation to current replication sites in Ohio, Maryland and Virginia. These sites receive inservice workshops, classroom observation and technical assistance in program planning and measuring and reporting child progress.

Local curriculum assistants also participate in a two-week Training Institute sponsored by High/Scope's Personnel Training Project. An annual conference for the curriculum assistants at the special education replication sites is a part of the Outreach Project as well. The purpose of the conference is to strengthen technical competence in teaching and teacher training. This will be accomplished through the exchange of experiences and perspectives and the sharing of common problems and potential solutions.

A newsletter reporting progress throughout the replication network is published twice a year. New teaching ideas, creative approaches to reaching parents, communities and the elementary schools enrolling the programs' preschool children are included. Emphasis is placed on illustrating successful implementation of the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum framework with young handicapped children.

State and regional conferences are presented for groups serving handicapped preschoolers. These conferences will orient teacher trainers and curriculum specialists to High/Scope's developmental approach to early childhood special education. They include principles of child development, establishing a preschool program based on High/Scope's Open Framework curriculum, and strategies for working with children with special needs.

Follow-up technical assistance sessions for teacher trainers are two-day regional preview sessions of selected learning packages and discussion of training methods. Individualized technical assistance in planning inservice teacher training programs is provided to resource centers, school districts, and teacher training institutions.

Visitor orientation to the Demonstration Preschool is continued under the Outreach project. An introduction to the curriculum approach and its applicability in an integrated (handicapped and nonhandicapped) setting is provided in addition to classroom observation.

For more information, contact Michael Hanes, Project Director, High/Scope Foundation, 600 N. River St., Ypsilanti, MI 48197.

The High/Scope Foundation First Chance Outreach Project is funded by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S. Office of Education, Grant #444BH70073.

High/Scope Educational Research Foundation

600 North River Street
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197
(313) 485-2000

David P. Weikart, Ph.D.
President

1977-78

SUMMARY OF THE

HIGH/SCOPE FOUNDATION EARLY CHILDHOOD PERSONNEL TRAINING PROJECT

The purpose of the project is to provide inservice training for teachers and other educational personnel who are using High/Scope's Cognitively Oriented Preschool Curriculum in Michigan and New Jersey. The curriculum model and training/delivery system developed by the High/Scope-BEH projects have been targeted to serve children in the rapidly expanding preprimary programs for mildly and moderately handicapped children. One of the major strengths of the High/Scope model is that it is a developmental approach stressing the teacher's role in supporting, exercising, and challenging the child's emerging abilities, rather than a remedial approach aimed primarily at the handicapping condition. The goal of the project is to help teachers support strengths and view children first as children rather than address children primarily in terms of their weaknesses or handicaps.

Methods and Procedures

The project has several inservice training options aimed at upgrading preschool programming. All are non-degree, non-certification training programs, but in several cases credits towards degrees or certificates have been given through cooperating degree-granting institutions (Merrill-Palmer Institute in Detroit, Pacific Oaks in Pasadena, California, Bank Street College in New York City, and Paterson State College in Wayne, New Jersey.)

1. Inservice Training to Selected Preprimary Programs in Michigan and New Jersey.

This component of the project continues intensive inservice training to programs which have indicated a high degree of commitment to implementing the Cognitively Oriented Preschool Curriculum. Inservice training includes workshops on curriculum areas, classroom observation and evaluation of teachers, help with staff training and supervision for on-site personnel, and technical assistance in measuring and reporting child progress.

2. Inservice Workshops for Michigan and New Jersey.

These inservice workshops are aimed at providing a training alternative to programs that do not want to be replication sites but do wish to upgrade the capacity of the staff to implement a developmental approach to early childhood education. Teachers of nonhandicapped and handicapped preschool-aged children as well as auxiliary staff and administrators from five districts in New Jersey and five districts in Michigan participate in the workshop series.

3. Two-Week Institute for Inservice Trainers.

Short-term training institutes in Ypsilanti are for teacher trainers (curriculum assistants) in the programs which are using the High/Scope model as a basis of their curriculum for children and for staff training. The curriculum assistants have been trained in the High/Scope approach as teachers and are already assisting others to use the curriculum framework. The Institute focuses on trainer competencies such as: giving feedback to teachers based on classroom observation, running workshops based on High/Scope learning packages, and developing the parent component of an early childhood education program.

4. Nine-Month Institute for Leaders in Early Childhood Special Education.

This long-term training institute prepares individuals as teacher trainers, program consultants, and educational change-agents in a variety of settings. The competencies graduates are expected to acquire include: applying knowledge of human development in an educational program which includes young handicapped children; competence in teaching young handicapped children within the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum; expressing knowledge of developmental theory, educational practice, and the relationships between them; and planning and executing a project of educational significance. The Institute is offered to five individuals who already have special education certification and masters' degrees and is run in conjunction with the High/Scope Graduate Program in Education and Human Development.

For more information contact Michael Hanes, Project Director, High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 600 N. River St., Ypsilanti, MI 48197.

The High/Scope Foundation Early Childhood Personnel Training Project is funded by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S. Office of Education, Grant #451AH70307.